

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
Faculty of Social Sciences and Education
Centre for Baltic Studies

Hanna Brauer

**Language Teachers in an Instrumentalist World – Language Legitimization in
Teaching Swedish in Turku**

Master's thesis in the Baltic Sea Region Studies MA program

Supervisor: Dr. Tatjana Kiilo

Tartu, June 2015

This thesis conforms to the requirements for a Master's thesis

.....(signature of the supervisor and date)

Submitted for defence (date)

This thesis is 24,960 words in length.

I have written this Master's thesis independently.

Any ideas or words taken from other authors have been fully referenced.

I hereby grant permission for the publication of this Master's thesis on both Dspace and the Centre for Baltic Studies webpage.

(Signature)

(Date)

Acknowledgements

A lot of people have assisted and supported me in the writing process. Without them, this thesis certainly would not have been completed. My thanks goes out to all of them.

Heiko Pääbo and Siiri Maimets from University of Tartu for always being there for us students with all our concerns and for showing genuine interest in our progress.

My supervisor Tatiana Kiilo for her invaluable advice and input, for repeatedly getting me out when I was stuck in a rut and for her readiness to supervise me at a distance.

Sylvia Ylinen-Rauscher from University of Turku for having the idea that saved this thesis and for inspiring me to carry on.

All my interview participants for their openness and friendliness. I am immeasurably grateful for how you let me get a glimpse into your world. You always made me feel at ease during the interviews, and they have become unforgettable experiences.

My friends on both shores of the Gulf of Finland for sticking with me even when the writing made me unbearable. Your patience is beyond compare.

Finally, my biggest thanks goes out to my parents, who continue to inspire me. You have always supported me through all my endeavours and believed in me. I would not have made it here without you, and I have no words for how grateful I am for that.

“Those of us ... living in asymmetry are the only ones condemned to perpetually reflect upon language, the only ones forced to know that the English language cannot dictate ‘truths’ and that there are other ‘truths’ in this world...”

Minae Mizumura, *The Fall of Language in the Age of English*

“Human stupidity has divided up language into a plurality of grammars, each claiming to be the 'right' one, to reflect the clarity of thought of a whole people. ... Each people learns the rules of its own grammar, deluding itself that it is these same rules that will resolve life's mysteries...”

Diego Marani, *New Finnish Grammar*

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with language teachers' role in language value transmission as part of language instruction. It uses the case of Swedish instruction in Finland to study the impact of societal negotiation of language value on this aspect of teachers' work. The thesis is written against the backdrop of the citizens' initiative for elective Swedish instruction from spring 2013 to spring 2015 and the associated public discussion. The theoretical framework is based on Pierre Bourdieu's theory on legitimate language and language legitimization via education. It is used to examine the extent to which Swedish teachers regard themselves as agents in language legitimization and the impact of heightened dispute on the value of Swedish on teachers' practices. The thesis also contributes to the understanding of the relationship between teachers' own notions of language value and those existing in the language ideological debate at large. The analysis is based on nine interviews with Swedish teachers done in the Finnish town of Turku in spring 2015, analysed using discursive psychology methods.

The thesis reveals that teachers participate as agents in language legitimization, though to a smaller extent than predicted, as several structural and systemic arrangements of their everyday work stand in the way. Additionally, it is found that language legitimization is not just a delegated task but that it also aligns to an extent with teachers' own views. The challenges posed by public value contest vary across level and context of instruction, and participants have found different ways of working around them. Due to recent developments in language education in Finland, the thesis concludes by suggesting that such an analysis be applied to Finnish teachers of different languages.

Keywords: Finland, language acquisition policy, language legitimization, language ideological debate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	7
2.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
2.1.	The Concepts of “Linguistic Market” and “Legitimate Language” - Different Forms of Language Value	11
2.2.	The Role of Education and Teachers in the Establishment and Maintenance of Legitimacy	14
2.3.	Discourse Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis	17
3.	METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK	
3.1.	Research Aim and Research Questions	21
3.2.	Discursive Psychology	24
3.3.	Data Collection and Analysis	27
3.4.	Limitations	29
4.	LOCATING THE STUDY	
4.1.	History of Finland's Bilingualism and Current Situation	31
4.2.	“Making Swedish an Elective Subject at all Levels of Instruction” and Macro-level Discourses in the Discussion on Swedish Acquisition Policy	37
4.3.	Language and Policy Legitimization in Swedish Instruction	43
5.	ANALYSIS	
5.1.	The Role of Swedish Teachers in Language Legitimization	49
5.2.	Swedish Teachers' Views on Language Valuation and the Language Debate	58
5.3.	The Impact of Macro-level Discourses on the Local Level	65
6.	CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	75
	REFERENCES	80
	APPENDICES	88
Appendix 1	List of Participants	
Appendix 2	Questionnaires	
Appendix 3	Consent Form	

1. INTRODUCTION

Finland is a country with two national languages, Finnish and Swedish, both of which are compulsory subjects throughout secondary school and university. While the position of Finnish as a compulsory school subject has been essentially uncontested, the discussion on Swedish acquisition policy is nearly as old as the country itself (cf. Bruun 2015). In spite of these repeated and increasingly heated discussions, mandatory Swedish instruction has always been backed by authorities and Swedish has maintained its position as a compulsory subject. Matti Ahtisaari therefore states that “Finland's language question is not a question, it is a 'non-question', to put it into diplomatic terms”¹ (qtd. in Rostila 2014, p. 9).

From March 2013 to March 2015, the position of Swedish as a compulsory subject within Finland's national education system was for the first time politically threatened: A citizens' initiative titled “Making Swedish an elective subject at all levels of instruction”², demanding the abolition of compulsory Swedish instruction as well as abolition of the language requirements in public office, collected enough signatures to be turned into a legislative proposal - and for the first time in history, Finland's parliament was voting on the status of Swedish as a school subject, eventually rejecting the proposal. Unsurprisingly, political proceedings were heavily mediatized, both extolling the benefits of, and questioning the value of, Swedish acquisition for Finnish students.

¹ Translation by author. Original reads ”Suomen kielikysymys ei ole kysymys, se on ’a non-question’, kuten diplomaattikielellä sanottaisiin.”

² Translation by author. Original reads “Ruotsin kieli valinnaiseksi oppiaineeksi kaikilla kouluasteilla”. This unofficial translation will be used throughout the thesis.

It is a truism in language education that learning a language is more than the acquisition of language skills – pedagogical research shows that language acquisition teaches cultural relativity and adds to students' identity by making them speakers of a new language (cf. Salo 2011, p. 45). However, it is difficult to find a solid theoretical perspective explaining the link between macro-level public deliberations on the value of a particular language and individual choices and views in teaching and learning of that language, i.e. in-classroom practices. The theoretical framework used in this thesis is taken from the field of sociology of education: Pierre Bourdieu's theory on legitimate language and language legitimization via education. Bourdieu assumes that national education systems are instrumental in creating positive valuation of the official language(s) by presenting certain understandings in instruction. These understandings are publicly rivalled and deconstructed in contest for legitimacy. Legitimization of Swedish instruction in Finland is based on the positioning of Finland as a Nordic country, on historical heritage and on the contribution of mandatory instruction to equality between speaker groups. Arguments against mandatory Swedish call into question the extent to which said understandings actually do make Swedish a valuable language to study. Additionally, they offer alternative frames of language valuation, like language usefulness in the world economy. In line with Blommaert's (1999) elaborations on language ideological debates, the discussion on mandatory Swedish is thus a discussion on language value – and the discussion in the context of the citizens' initiative marks a climax therein.

Climax moments have important implications for teachers of the subject in question: Teachers are presumed by Bourdieu to be tasked with passing on the understandings that underlie current policy. During climax moments, values that have previously been assumed to be self-evident are now publicly being called into question. Bourdieu consequently assumes that, as naturalized value conceptions crumble, teachers have to fill in, demonstrating on their own account the value in their subject. Previous research has shown that Swedish teachers often consider themselves tasked with passing on the understandings that underpin state language policy (cf. e.g. Salo 2010b). At the same time, it has also revealed that they tend not to contribute to public discussion,

whereby the impact of public value contest on their in-classroom experiences, including on their involvement in value transmission, largely remains hidden (cf. Salo 2010a). This thesis aims to make a contribution to alleviating this situation by casting light on the connection between macro-level discourse and teachers' language legitimization practices; with particular emphasis on the impact of climax moments.

The role of Swedish teachers in language value transmission and the impact of increased public value contest will be examined by answering three research questions:

- To what extent do Swedish language teachers regard language legitimization as their task?
- How do language values expressed by Swedish teachers relate to language values expressed at macro level?
- How do experiences with the task of language legitimization change during moments of heightened contest of legitimacy as seen by Swedish teachers?

Dominant macro-level discourses are defined as based on previous research (primarily Hult & Pietikäinen 2014; Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001). Further, the thesis distinguishes between instrumentalist and romantic value notions of language in line with Blommaert's writing on language ideological debates (1999). In order to answer the above questions, the author conducted interviews with teachers of Swedish at both school and university level between February and March 2015. A total of nine interviews were performed for this thesis. All interviews were conducted in the Finnish town of Turku, where all participants were working at the time of the interviews. There are significant differences in the percentage of Swedish-speakers in the different regions of Finland, and the choice of location was made over how representative it is of the national average in that respect. Interview data was then analysed using tools from discursive psychology. The methodological approach allowed maintaining a double focus in analysing the impact of macro-level discourse on statements made and situations reported on in interviews.

The thesis first will introduce the theoretical concepts used in this research. Further, this part explains the role of teachers as per the theoretical framework and presents the main assumptions of discourse theory. Subsequently, the methodological framework will be explained. This thesis is grounded in a distinction between micro- and macro-level discourse, using discursive psychology tools for the analysis of social text. The methodology chapter will also present my research aim in more detail as well as commenting on data collection, analysis and thesis limitations. Afterwards, the thesis provides a short overview of the history of Finland's bilingualism as well the present-day linguistic situation, paying particular attention to factors that affect a language's position in line with the theoretical framework. This part also introduces the empirical case of the citizens' initiative. The thesis reviews existing literature on both Finland's language ideological debate, and on teachers' role and aims in Swedish instruction. This serves to identify major Discourses³ relevant for my empirical case. It also establishes Swedish teachers' central role in creating attitudes towards and valuations of the language among students. The main part of the thesis is made up of an analysis of interview data collected by the author. This part serves to answer the research questions, illuminating the views teachers have of language legitimization and of how the present instance of public value renegotiation impacts this aspect of their work. Outcomes are summed up in the discussion and conclusion part, which in addition to providing answers to my research questions also contextualizes this analysis and brings up questions for potential further research.

³ In line with Alvesson and Kärreman (2000), this thesis distinguishes between discourse with a lower-case letter and Discourse with a capital letter, where the former indicates micro-level and the latter macro-level discourse. To maintain this distinction, „Discourse“ will be spelled in this manner whenever it is synonymous with “macro-level discourse”. The exception is with direct quotes taken from other authors who do not make this spelling distinction.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis draws for its theoretical framework primarily on two seminal works by Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991) and *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1977). Here, Bourdieu traces how understandings of how the world is structured and the values these structures create induce agents to act in a certain manner. Maintenance of social structures in this view is achieved by the transmission of certain value notions which are subject to ongoing contest. Bourdieu is part of the school of conflict theory in sociology of education which considers schools as institutions to be functioning to the benefit of dominant groups (cf. Provenzo 2009). I augment this theory's implications for the transmission of language valuation by drawing on terms from Blommaert's *Language Ideological Debates* (1999) which examines the discursive negotiation of languages and their values. By doing so, I also incorporate discourse theory in the theoretical framework.

2.1 The Concepts of “Linguistic Market” and “Legitimate Language” - Different Forms of Language Value

Like all conflict theorists, Bourdieu departs from Marx, but augments Marx's focus on economic capital by applying the notion of capital, value and market to symbolic and cultural goods as well. In the case of language, the relevant space is termed the “linguistic market”. Thompson defines a market in Bourdieu's sense as “a structured space of positions in which the positions and their interrelations are determined by the distribution of different kinds of resources, or 'capital'” (in Bourdieu 1991, p. 14). The linguistic market is then the space from which the value of a linguistic competence arises.

On a market, different forms of capital can be traded in for one another, since they all have a certain value attached to them. This value is not intrinsic but is created by structures existing in other fields which mutually shape each other. Put simply, language here moves beyond being a mere tool of expression and becomes a commodity whose value derives from the structuring of all fields available due to their interrelation. This can go so far as to make a language itself embody certain values via its connection to sociopolitical standpoints (cf. Blommaert 1999). It is important to stress that language in this model has value through the market *only* – not intrinsically: “One cannot save the *value* of a competence unless one saves the market, in other words, the whole set of political and social conditions of production of the producers/consumers.” (Bourdieu 1991, p. 57). One thus has to assume that texts produced within language ideological debates always have expanded meaning.

There are different kinds of value, expressed in different market representations and beliefs as to the principles on which language (acquisition) policy should be founded. As per Blommaert (1999, p. 9), the struggle in debates on language ideology “develops usually over *definitions* of social realities: various representations of reality which are pitted against each other – discursively – with the aim of gaining authority for one particular representation”. Said different representations thus start from different views of how value arises; market structures are consequently not purely objective but rather subject to representation which can only be grasped by analysis of discourse.

Blommaert (1999) makes an overarching distinction between two types of language ideology and their associated valuations. He terms the first one “instrumentalist ideology”, meaning that “language is seen as a tool for transforming ideas into new linguistic patterns” (Blommaert 1999, p. 13). At first sight, this ideology could be taken to mean that no expanded meaning is accorded to language, since it is only viewed as a tool for expression. However, since, languages are here taken to always be illustrative of further ideological meaning, emphasis on instrumental notions and language utility is an ideology in itself, since it rejects the second major ideological stance. Blommaert (1999, p. 13) terms it the “romantic ideology, in which language is an abstract idea inextricably linked with a people's 'soul'”. This opposition in market

structure representation and resulting value notions appears pervasive of language debates as per Blommaert (1999). It contrasts languages serving “instrumental and pragmatic purposes” (Bokhorst-Heng in: Blommaert 1999, p. 240) with “languages of identity, of ethnicity and of culture [...], languages of good values, [...] of a 'whole philosophy of life', [...], languages of national cohesion” (ibid.). I believe this opposition to have clear relevance in my empirical case, as will be demonstrated later in my literature review.

According to Bourdieu, nation-states play an important, if not the most important, role in structuring a field, as state policies create the rules for capital conversion. Here is where Bourdieu skips from the notion of “official status” to “legitimate status” in stating that “in order for one mode of expression [...] to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified” (Bourdieu 1991, p. 45), i.e. there needs to be an overarching belief in the same valuations attached to individual languages. These valuations stems from uniform notions which in turn tend to derive from official regulations. Subsequently, “official” and “legitimate” are often used rather interchangeably, though in my view, a certain difference exists which is of importance here.

Official status is state-imposed and traceable in written regulations. This is a very straight-forward definition overlapping with the understanding of legitimate language in general parlance (e.g. “a language that has legal status in a particular legally constituted political entity such as a State or part of a State, and that serves as a language of administration” (OECD 2013)).

Legitimate status of a language as per Bourdieu is subconscious. At the most basic level it implies acceptance of and belief in the ideologies and structures that underlie the dominant notion of legitimacy and its inherent values. In the long run, this acceptance and belief lead to the development of what Bourdieu terms a “habitus” - “a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways.” (Thompson in Bourdieu 1991, p. 12). In *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, the concept of legitimacy is thus primarily used to refer to the outcome of a process in which the arbitrary character of both the mode of instruction and the content of instruction are

hidden, leading to misrecognition of the processes that determine what is instructed and how this is to be done. Full legitimacy, then, is also expressed in an absence of questioning current regulations and the structures and assumptions they reflect, which in the long run leads to people acting in line with those very structures and the values they imply. Conversely, situations of calling into question the contents or form of instruction, and by extension the principles which underpin the latter, are cases of contested legitimacy.

Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture addresses what happens when more than one claim to legitimacy exists: The outcome is a “sociologically necessary competition” that results from how “legitimacy is indivisible” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 18), i.e. as long as differing ideas of legitimacy exist within a field, competition will take place. Claims to legitimacy always have sociopolitical implications (cf. Blommaert 1999, p. 2) and reflect the power relations between the groups involved due to the interconnectedness of fields. There will be very dominant claims and less dominant claims, so that the relationship between official status and legitimate status is not all that straightforward in practice. We now need to take a look at the role education plays in making the transition from official to legitimate language.

2.2 The Role of Education and Teachers in the Establishment and Maintenance of Legitimacy

The field of education takes on a special position in establishing and maintaining (language) legitimacy: Pedagogic action creates legitimacy by way of what Bourdieu calls “the transubstantiation of power relationships into legitimate authority” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 15). Education therefore offers the clearest view of how legitimization takes place, i.e. of how the dominant culture and its inherent value notions are maintained. Because of Bourdieu's nation-state centric view in market control, he regards the national school system as the most dominant system and presumes it to be “the one which most fully [...] corresponds to the objective interests [...] of the dominant groups

or classes, both by its mode of imposition and by its delimitation of what and on whom, it imposes” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 7). An analysis of the mode of imposition as well as of the content of state-imposed teaching should thus reveal by means of what arguments legitimacy is created, and how social structures are represented in order to achieve an understanding of the choice of both mode of imposition and teaching content.

It remains important to restate that following this argumentation, what is taught is not (only) knowledge – it is knowledge accompanied by a way of structuring the world. These structures are not objective realities. Instead, they come with a number of understandings that become visible in struggles for legitimacy, since these debates are struggles over “*definitions* of social realities: various representations of reality which are pitted against each other – discursively – with the aim of gaining authority for one particular representation.” (Blommaert 1999, p. 9).

Within this view of the aim and content of instruction, teachers are regarded as agents in the reproduction of the existing structures. By extension, they can be expected to reproduce the understandings underlying said structures, and to pass on those discourses which argue in their favour. Teachers have “pedagogic authority”, delegated by the dominant group and applied within an institutionalized education system. Pedagogic authority is defined as “a power to exert symbolic violence which manifests itself in the form of a right to impose legitimately [and] reinforces the arbitrary power which establishes it and which it conceals.” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 13). Teachers' task is thus maintenance of the current system by reinforcement of current market structures and, by extension, valuations.

Bourdieu accords those commissioned to exercise pedagogic action “relative autonomy” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 12) within the institutional structures they derive their authority from. While they may have a range of choices concerning e.g. their methods of instruction, teachers are primarily regarded as state agents tasked with passing on the dominant cultural arbitrary, i.e. the version of the structuring of the world as seen by whoever is regarded to be the most dominant actor. To be transmitted in pedagogy are “the fundamental principles of the cultural arbitrary [...] worthy of reproduction” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 26) which on account of the delegation involved are not for teachers

to select. Institutional unification is crucial in legitimacy creation: The institutional set-up under normal circumstances hides questions as to the aims and contents of instruction, while unified markets all produce rewards for learning what is expected and punishments for failing to do so, which induces certain behaviour. An example of such market unification is for instance language requirements for public office, which are usually state-regulated.

I have established above that I consider my case one of “contested legitimacy”. This has important repercussions for teachers' work: “At moments of crisis when the tacit contract of delegation legitimating the [education system] is threatened, the teachers [...] are called upon to resolve, each on his [sic] own behalf, the questions which the institution tended to exclude by its very functioning.” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 62). It is important to stress here that this questioning does not have to be a questioning of institutionalized education per se. This is neither found in my empirical case nor in the examples provided by Bourdieu. What becomes visible in cases of threat is “the objective truth of the teacher's job, i.e. the social and institutional conditions which make it possible” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 62). I would argue that these become visible in the discussion on mandatory Swedish, as the latter invokes a making explicit of assumptions as to what state education can and should do (institutional conditions) as well as to what value knowledge of Swedish has to Finnish students (social conditions) and thus hold this to be the primary argument in the relevance of my theoretical framework for my empirical case. From this, it is possible to develop the overarching hypothesis that the discussion on mandatory Swedish forces teachers into increasingly visible practices of language legitimization.

In order to delimit what instructional practices should be considered legitimizing in their function in the following, the following two points need to be stressed.

- Legitimacy transmission is not (primarily) concerned with improving learning outcomes but with “schemes of perception, thought, appreciation and action” (Bourdieu 1977, p. 35). Bourdieu's focus in describing the outcomes of instruction is not on capacity, i.e. ability to perform an action, but on disposition, i.e. likelihood to perform an action.

- The aim of the education system is considered to be maintenance of social order in spite of competition for social and cultural dominance (cf. Bourdieu 1977, p. 10). This maintenance is achieved via the legitimization of the principles that underpin the current order. As such, perceptions and thoughts passed on have to be exclusively applicable to the order that is supposed to be kept in place. As soon as the point in learning becomes transferable, instruction is no longer regarded as specifically catering to keeping dominant notions in place and thus no longer as “legitimizing”.

The difficulty often inherent in an analysis of how legitimization practices relate to understandings existing in society at large lies in Bourdieu's assumption of value internalization (cf. the concept of “habitus”), i.e. in applying this theory to an empirical case it might often be difficult to identify notions relevant for value formation. In an explicit language debate, however, discourse is a crucial resource (cf. Blommaert 1999, p. 7), definitions relevant for value formation are thus made explicit and it becomes possible to identify different representations. Additionally, the empirical case meets the criteria for constituting a crisis moment. It is thus suited for examining not only the extent to which teachers are agents in transmitting notions, but also the impact that increasing contest of these representations has for their work. I shall now proceed to presenting the main assumptions of discourse theory as represented in Critical Discourse Analysis.

2.3 Discourse Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis

This thesis makes a distinction between Discourse (macro-level, standardized patterns) and discourse (micro-level, local instantiation) as inspired by Alvesson and Kärreman. While my own analysis uses categories from discursive psychology for the analysis of micro-level text, it is paramount to also present the most central assumptions of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) since CDA necessarily connects to overarching patterns and ideologies (cf. Fairclough 2010, p. 9) and is thus suitable for gaining an

understanding of macro-level dynamics. We have seen above that during language ideological debates, discourse becomes a “crucial symbolic resource onto which people project their interest, around which they can construct alliances, on and through which they exercise power” (Blommaert 1999, p. 7). Examining the basic assumptions of CDA in how discourse connects to social structures and practices thus helps understand how discourse becomes an instrument of power in the first place. My understanding of CDA is based on works by Fairclough.

Fairclough (2003, p. 205) describes life as made up of “social practices”, “relatively stabilized forms of social activity” that involve certain actors and take place in certain settings with certain meanings. Language used in these settings creates discourses, which are “diverse representations of social life which are inherently positioned” (Fairclough 2003, p. 206). Thus, representations are never objective but are always part of an overarching system which Fairclough (2003, p. 206) calls the social order, which is “social practices networked in a particular way”. Because certain discourses are linked to certain social practices, what emerges is an “order of discourse”. Some discourses are dominant to a point where they become common sense, others are divergent to a point where they are considered unacceptable.

Fairclough describes the relationship between discourse and social life as dialectic, a constant mutual influence of one on the other. Discourses are representations “of how things are and have been, as well as imaginaries – ‘representations of how things might or could or should be’” (Fairclough 2003, p. 207). People may locate themselves in the representations created by these discourses, making them reality. Discourses are thus important tools in trying to implement changes. Texts of a strongly discursive character “include imaginaries for change and for new practices and systems” as well as “discourses, narratives and arguments which interpret, explain and justify the area of social life they are focused upon – its past, its present, and its possible future” (Fairclough 2010, p. 18). Discourses thus also drive conceptions of what is normal, just or appropriate.

However, discourses can also be conceived of as even more impactful: If interpreted to have what Alvesson and Kärreman (2000, p. 1130) term “durable meaning”, i.e. beyond a concrete speaking situation, then “discourse drives subjectivity” (Alvesson & Kärreman 2000, p. 1131) and thus influences perception. This is reflected in Fairclough's views on CDA for instance in the notion of ideological-discursive formations which have implications for which patterns become naturalized in perception and thus unquestioned common sense (cf. Fairclough 2010).

There are important parallels between Bourdieu's understanding of language in society, and that of critical discourse analysts: Blommaert (2005, p. 27) describes the main roots of CDA in social theory as “a lively interest in the theories of power and ideology” and “an attempt to overcome structuralist determinism”. Particularly in the latter aim, frequent reference is made to *Language and Symbolic Power* in particular over the way that people situate themselves in the structures of a market and how their actions contribute to the maintenance of the latter. For instance, language loss may seem like an inevitable strike of fate – instead, Bourdieu (1991, p. 49) observes how the “holders of dominated linguistic competences [...] collaborate in the destruction of their instruments of expression” by preferring to use the more valued language. Candlin, in his foreword to *Critical Discourse Analysis*, goes so far as to say that Fairclough comes closest to Bourdieu in his understanding of the connection of structure and strategy, i.e. a local working-around major ideologies as expressed in discourse.

As per Fairclough (2003, p. 207),

“a particular social structuring of semiotic difference may become hegemonic, become part of the legitimizing common sense which sustains relations of domination, but hegemony will always be contested to a greater or lesser extent, in hegemonic struggle”.

In chapter 2.1, I have outlined my understanding of full legitimacy as becoming visible in the subconscious acceptance of the assumptions that underlie the current social order and its manifold implications (e.g. what language should be official). Here, Fairclough establishes that discourses are instrumental in creating this acceptance. In attempting to develop a synthesis, I would like to point out that “hegemonic struggle” should not

necessarily be understood as a debate on social structures per se – all fields are linked to the social order, consequently, the dominant order and the understandings that are linked to it can be questioned in many fields. Positions taken up in one field are then Bourdieu's “symbolic relations” (1977, p. 18) – they are reflective of views on the overarching social structure, but they can remain entirely limited to comments on the question at hand. This is why language ideological debates are debates on more than just language.

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Research Aim and Research Questions

In this thesis, I conceive of the discussion on the citizens' initiative and its associated real possibility of Swedish becoming an elective subject as a moment of climax and thereby as a moment of crisis of instruction in Bourdieu's sense (cf. Bourdieu 1977, p. 62). The crisis takes place in the form of discursive renegotiation of the understandings that underpin the values inherent in current state language acquisition regulations. On the basis of previous literature, I will regroup in 4.2 what I believe to be the main Discourses circulating in Finland's language discussion which are relevant for the social and institutional conditions of Swedish instruction. My empirical material will be analysed in relation to these Discourses.

Taking the discussion on the citizens' initiative as an instance of language ideological debate with its associated centrality of discourse has the added advantage of public visibility of the discourses associated with it. A professor of social sciences interviewed on citizens initiatives actually regards this as their main task: “[Citizens' initiatives] engender discourse on the matter. Not just those who have supported the initiative, but also among the larger public” (Anonymous 2014). Obtaining a grasp of existing conceptions is difficult because of the often invisible character of views of many social actors. These debates however, since they take place in the field of discourse, demand attempts at explication of viewpoints and thereby draw into the open and make explicit latent understandings of the role of Swedish and the reasons behind its current status and acquisition regulations.

My own analysis departs from Bourdieu's assumptions for teachers' role in legitimacy creation: That they are agents in language legitimization, and in moments of crisis are forced to explicitly argue in favour of state value notions, representing underlying understandings strategically. Beyond merely analysing interview content, data will also be evaluated regarding its discursive relationship with identified macro-level discourses, which are taken to function as an “ordering force” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 418) for social text. This allows assessing the relevance of individual value notions and by extension Discourses within teachers' legitimization practices, and the extent to which they might function as obstacles or means of support as people work with and around Discourse in speaking. Discourse is also regarded not “as a purely individual phenomenon: it is intimately linked to the performance of wider roles, identities and institutions” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 428). The approach chosen thus also enables reflection on what roles participants think they play as Swedish teachers, how they define their own task, where their responsibilities begin and end and how they themselves conceive of language value – all in relation to the changing notions of language value in general and the changes in the value of Swedish in particular.

Resembling the marginalization of teachers in neoliberal discourses on education (cf. Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001), there is a similar observation to be made for the discussion on Swedish as a school subject for, as Salo (2010a, p. 356) writes, “Swedish teachers appear to participate quite rarely in these discussions”⁴. He posits that this is because teachers are already forced into having these discussions with their students, meaning that they thereby remain hidden. This is a counterintuitive development, for it is assumed that precisely during moments of heightened debate, teachers' role in legitimization becomes particularly prominent. This thesis thus makes a contribution to alleviating this gap.

This thesis is qualitative in its approach. This decision is driven by the limited number of interview participants and the large amount of data collected during each

⁴ Translation by author. Original reads „[...] ruotsinopettajat näyttävät ottavan melko harvoin osaa näihin keskusteluihin.“

individual interview. It thus becomes possible to not only investigate the extent to which language legitimization is regarded as teachers' task and whether a heightened instance of conflict truly increases the extent to which teachers engage in explicit language legitimization, but also to examine how Discourses in this particular instance are used as resources or experienced as obstacles by participants. A qualitative approach enables one to “appreciate the flexibility and variability of language-use” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 429) that characterizes social texts such as interview data. The trade-off is that this thesis does not aim to be a representative study: It applies the theory to a particular empirical case, but due to the level of detail required by the approach chosen, as well as the importance of considering the context to any case of legitimacy contest in order to properly identify the most relevant Discourses, the thesis does not claim applicability of findings across different settings or actors.

My analysis is guided by the following research questions:

- To what extent do Swedish language teachers regard language legitimization as their task?
- How do language values expressed by Swedish teachers relate to language values expressed at macro level?
- How do experiences with the task of language legitimization change during moments of heightened contest of legitimacy as seen by Swedish teachers?

The first and the last research questions are derived immediately from the theoretical framework, applying Bourdieu's theory on language legitimization to Swedish instruction in Finland and testing his assumptions for the implications of crises in legitimacy. The second research question derives from my own analysis of the empirical material collected for the thesis, which reveals an interesting distinction between the values stressed by interview participants and those found in studies on the macro-level discussion. This distinction also has implications for teachers' self-views, their opinions on the language discussion and their views on the task of language legitimization.

This thesis adds to existing research due to two major factors: First, it applies the legitimization concept to Swedish instruction in Finland. This has the advantage of

moving away from the focus on instrumentalist notions of language value that appear to be inherent in perspectives that focus on student motivation (a perspective that previous studies on the topic have usually adopted). Instead, the approach allows checking for a wider scope of value notions since macro-level discourse still contains both instrumentalist and romantic notions. Second, the time frame of the writing of this thesis coincides with the instance of the language debate that is here conceived of as a climax moment. This allowed the author, while examining previous studies on Finland's language debate, to compare the arguments present within them to those present at this particular point, and to identify those that are still relevant for macro-level discourse.

This thesis does not strive explicitly to offer solutions – this would require proposing solutions for the resolution of the language conflict, which in turn would require an analysis of macro-level discourse to examine where understandings overlap and where they diverge. This far exceeds the scope of this thesis. Rather, this thesis is driven by the belief that the voices of those who are “absent presence[s]” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 96) in the Discourse structuring their field of activity deserve to be heard, and that shifts in language valuation at macro level have significant implications at the micro level, which this thesis makes a (non-exhaustive) contribution to tracking.

3.2 Discursive Psychology

I derive my distinction between micro- and macro-level discourse from Alvesson and Kärreman (2000). They locate their distinction as relevant for organizational studies, and indeed it is a well-suited instrument for the analysis of professional roles where interactions are shaped by overarching structures and their inherent role understandings, presenting a need to combine both forms of discourse within a single analysis (cf. Stanley and Billig 2004).

One of Alvesson and Karreman's (2000) main distinctions in “Varieties of Discourse” is between “discourse” and “Discourse”, where the former emphasizes the “local, situational context” and language is “understood in relationship to the specific process and social context in which discourse is produced” (Alvesson & Karreman 2000, p. 1133), whereas the latter implies that discourse is a “universal, if historically situated, set of vocabularies, standing loosely coupled to, referring to or constituting a particular phenomenon” (ibid.). On this scale, analyses of Finland's language discussion aiming at general statements on the patterns and outcomes of language value formation fall more into the category of Discourse, whereas interview material, as per Alvesson and Karreman (2000) the primordial form of social text alongside interactions from everyday life, has to be classified as discourse. It is very much possible to combine both forms of discourse into a single study to involve the broader ideological context (cf. Alvesson and Karreman 2000, p. 1134; Stanley and Billig 2004, p. 160). Here, we are looking at a combination of long-range, established discourse with social text in the form of interview material. For these types of study, Whittle and Mueller characterize Discourse as “a powerful ordering force” (2010, p. 418) and the “standardized ways of referring to/constituting a certain kind of phenomenon” (2010, p. 419) whereas discourse describes “how a certain 'thing' is talked about in actual conversations” (ibid.).

For investigating how the two levels are connected, discursive psychology offers useful tools. Discursive psychology assumes that in social texts, people make accounts of “their interests in a particular state of affairs, their stake in a particular situation, or their motive in pursuing a particular course of action” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 416). It is also assumed that individuals negotiate their identities in exchange with others during interactions (cf. McLean 2012). Discursive psychology aims to recognize the influence of Discourse while remaining sensitive to the local context. Analytical categories from discursive psychology, focusing on the variability and flexibility of language-in-use, thus help demonstrate how speakers “work within and around [...] Discourses in a flexible and creative way to accomplish their practical actions” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 429).

The impact of Discourse on social text is manifold: As per Fairclough (2010), institutions introduce concepts and role understandings into Discourse. While talking about themselves, individuals take up position relative to the latter. The result is referred to as a subject position, “a process of an individual placing themselves or being placed in relation to others” (McLean 2012, p. 99). One prominent analytical category of discursive psychology is thus how role-taking instantiated in conversation relates to the roles provided by Discourse. Consequently, interactions are a process of self-definition on the basis of values and group identities. This is particularly interesting for interview data since research participants are likely to present themselves in a conscious manner (cf. Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 423).

Further, as outlined above, discursive psychology does not assume pre-existing and directly expressed stakes and interest, but sees the latter as constructed in and through interaction, i.e. social text. It thus becomes possible to analyse “how participants [...] ‘treat reports and descriptions as if they come from groups and individuals with interests, desires, ambitions and stake in some versions of what the world is like’” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 420), i.e. how participants ascribe the latter. Discursive psychology thus assumes that in speaking situations, individuals navigate and construct their own as well as others' interests, motives and so on, drawing on Discourses in circulation (cf. Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 427).

Navigating Discourse can in certain instances result in so-called ideological dilemmas, “a situation that forces a person to reassess their current practice and choose between mutually exclusive options for their continued practices or group memberships” (McLean 2012, p. 100). Ideological dilemmas are highly telling analytical concepts for two reasons: They reveal information about the speaker's identity construction on the basis of group memberships when speakers are confronted with having to make a choice between sets of group characteristics or trying to avoid making such a choice. At the same time, they are also revealing regarding the ideologies currently present in Discourse: Billig et al. locate the origin of these dilemmas in “lived ideologies” (qtd. in McLean 2012, p. 100), rooted in the common sense understandings characteristic (or assumed to be characteristic) of a particular group or the naturalization of certain forms of social life, including the roles assigned within them. When the

common sense understandings of two group identities that the speaker considers themselves part of are or appear to be mutually exclusive or the speaker is impacted by more than one currently circulating and contradictory ideologies, the result is an ideological dilemma.

Finally, Discourse provides the so-called interpretative repertoires for social texts, “basically a lexicon or register of terms and metaphors drawn upon to characterise and evaluate actions and events” (McLean 2012, p. 100). Once again, which lexicon or register is available to whom is a question of (constructed) identity, as certain elements of Discourse come to be associated with certain groups or positions. People can selectively assimilate or distance themselves from individual elements of Discourse to reach their interactional goals, and charting language use in social texts is telling as to the speaker's identity and consequently their position within the order of Discourse.

In line with the theoretical framework, discursive psychology allows study of how teachers' legitimization practices relate to representations circulating at macro level. A methodology that incorporates both versions of discourse also allows inquiry into how changes at the macro level affect the micro level and how individuals position themselves in relation to macro-level discourse.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

Even though other methods have become increasingly popular for analysis through discursive psychology, the classical setting is still the interview (cf. Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 419). In the case at hand, the researcher opted for semi-structured interviews (cf. appendix 2). Semi-structured interviews allow a combination of topical questions that ascertain continuing concentration of the interview on the research focus with letting the participant speak for themselves and take the floor for longer stretches. As advised by Kohler Riessman (1993, p. 55), the number of base questions was augmented by “probe questions” prepared in advance, which were asked when the participant's responses were very short, the participant did not understand the initial

question, or when the interviewer had reason to suspect the participant might want to say more on a given topic. The aim of not imposing too much structure was to create a natural atmosphere because such a setting has a tendency to be more conducive to longer stretches of and a more natural type of participant talk (cf. Kohler Riessman 1993).

A total of nine interviews were performed for this thesis. Interview partners were found at Turku Finnish-language schools and the Finnish-language university. School administrative offices were contacted in person to obtain the contact information of those teaching Swedish, potential participants were then contacted via e-mail outlining the research aim and conditions of participation. The researcher also contacted the Swedish teachers at the Finnish-language university, who teach compulsory Swedish classes to university students. All participants are female, with ages ranging from 25 to 53 and experience teaching Swedish ranging from half a year to 22 years. A list of participants can be found in the appendix to this paper.

Before the interviews, participants were provided with a short overview of the research aim and conditions in writing. The consent form handed out before interviews was drafted in reference to the British Sociological Association's Statement of Ethical Practice; it covered research methods, analysis methods, research aim, confidentiality and projected data usage and outlined these in a user-friendly language (cf. appendix 3). Participants were also informed that at all times they have the right to refuse an answer. All participants agreed to the conditions of participation.

Interviews were held according to participants' preferences, most took place in cafés, some participants also invited researcher to their office. Due to the semi-structured character of the interview questionnaire, the length of interviews varied, with the shortest one taking around thirty-five minutes and the longest one over an hour. Most interviews were conducted in English, except where participants requested another language. Overall, out of nine interviews, two took place in German, two in Finnish and the rest in English.

Quotes in the following taken from these interviews were translated into English by the researcher. All interviews were recorded and then manually transcribed for

analysis by the researcher. Due to discursive psychology's emphasis on authentic speech (cf. Lester 2014, p. 141), speech was not majorly corrected in transcripts. Repetitions, sentence corrections and longer pauses as well as non-verbal utterances therefore entered into transcripts. All names used in the analysis are pseudonyms.

Analysis was performed by marking in transcripts content that corresponded to the categories established in my theoretical framework. This involved e.g. isolating participants' comments on their perceived tasks or on arguments they reported to use in class. Direct discursive references were also isolated, as were participants' comments on the language debate and their personal views on Swedish instruction. Since participants' statements were at times overlapping, statements were then classified to identify important overarching sentiments and experiences and to isolate those quotes most representative of them, trying to maintain at all times a balance between finding common patterns and respecting individual patterns of language usage in an attempt to maximize explanatory power while keeping in with the constraints of a qualitative study.

3.4 Limitations

The primary limitation relevant for this thesis is the researcher's position as an outsider to the research issue. The researcher is therefore personally unacquainted outside her research with the structures in which her participants were and are working. Primary means of mitigation was extensive literature research. Additionally, the author considers it an advantage that her background as a foreigner with experience in language instruction allowed her to relate to participants' experiences without having personal biases.

This research project also involved the researcher using non-native languages. While two of the interviews were conducted in German, the researcher's mother tongue, most of them took place in English and two interviews in Finnish. Literature research also involved a large number of foreign-language sources. The author rates her Finnish

at B1-B2 level and her Swedish at B1-level, and worked to improve her language skills while conducting this research. A substantial part of the author's translations from Finnish were run by a native speaker.

Since participants were all volunteers, and only a small number of those contacted agreed to be interviewed, there is a certain bias among respondents. However, the author considers this to be an unavoidable drawback of overt research. Additionally, interviews have a tendency to yield public narratives, respondents saying what they believe a researcher wants to hear (cf. Lindblad and Popkewitz 2001). Again, this is to an extent an unavoidable phenomenon and can only be mitigated to an extent by providing a natural conversational setting, which the author aimed to do.

4 LOCATING THE STUDY

4.1 History of Finland's Bilingualism and Current Situation

Discourse research, like all social research, has to consider history, for one needs to know how discourses appear, in what contexts and how they change over time (cf. Blommaert 1999, 2005). Discourses in Finland's language debate often draw on history (cf. Salo 2010a and Salo 2012). Additionally, it is important to outline the “social genesis” (Bourdieu 1991, p. 44) of Finland's language regulations precisely because of the theoretical framework's emphasis on the social construction of language value (ibid.)

Finland's bilingualism has its origins in the time of the Swedish empire. Upwards social mobility required knowledge of Swedish as education functioned entirely in Swedish. Even after Finland was ceded to Russia in 1809, Swedish remained an official language and initially the only language of education. Social stratification was heavily language-dependent (cf. Sajavaara 2006), with Swedish-speakers dominating both public office and political posts. This entailed a certain stratification of language value, with Swedish the language associated with power and higher education.

Due to Russia's isolation, Finland industrialized relatively late, in the second half of the 19th century. Industrialization brought a number of changes. Along with the labour movement and the national movement came emphasis on education for all as an incarnation of the desire for political modernity. However, a more accessible education system also served a clear purpose regarding the relationship between linguistic groups: The national movement's goal of the creation of a Finnish-speaking middle and upper class to replace the Swedish-speaking one required a Finnish-language education

system at all levels of instruction. From the middle of the 19th century, this was gradually implemented. (cf. Unger 1986)

The quasi-monopoly of the Swedish-speaking nobility on high-ranking public office and the ensuing high status of the Swedish language thus crumbled along with two processes, the increasing specialization required for office-holders and the improving accessibility of Finnish-language education consequent to the Finnish national movement. These developments meant that from the second half of the 19th century, Finnish-speakers increasingly held political posts and public offices. On the eve of Finland's independence in 1917, the majority of the members of the Senate were Finnish-speakers. When Finnish- and Swedish-speakers' shared goal of attaining independence was reached, the result was a language conflict which “dominated disputes over civil service appointments throughout the decade and also continued to some extent into the 1930s” (Selovuori 1999, p. 213), making room for party-based politics only when the socio-economic background of both speaker groups had become more similar.

Finnish-speakers had challenged Swedish-speakers' position via “political, educational, socio-economic and constitutional” channels (Unger 1986, p. 73), pushing Swedish-speakers into a position where they first sought to maintain their dominance and later the equal position of their language. As such, the protection extended to Swedish in the 1919 constitution is a compromise (cf. Hult and Pietikäinen 2014) made between two influential speaker groups in a newly-founded state in the wake of one of the bloodiest civil wars in European history. This compromise has given Swedish a protected standing as an official language to this day.

Finland illustrates well several of the dynamics that Bourdieu (1991) outlines for the establishment of an official language: The change in language usage consequent to the elevation of standard Finnish to a language of education and administration had significant impact on the power relationships between the two ethnic groups: It ended unequal relationships cemented by the unequal valuation of the two languages, enabling Finnish-speakers to gain access to high-ranking public office. It also becomes apparent that language usage is tied to decisions influenced by said valuations and not (primarily)

by language competence: The national movement was initially carried by a middle class made up nearly entirely of Swedish-speakers who *chose* a shift to Finnish, while Finnish-speakers aiming at social mobility earlier had to *choose* to shift their usage to Swedish.

The conflict outlined above should leave no wrong impression – the process of resolution has been lauded for its relative peacefulness (cf. McRae 1999). However, it might just be that this peacefulness has contributed to the renegotiation one sees in the language debate, for, as McRae (1999, p. 4) writes, “Finland's language legislation has given peaceful change a clear priority over linguistic stability”. This becomes apparent when one considers the application of language legislation against the backdrop of demographic changes. The latter are one of the central issues in Finland's present-day linguistic landscape, which I shall now continue to shortly outline.

As per its constitution, present-day Finland has two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. Both languages can be used in communication with national authorities, and national authorities are obliged to provide official documents in both languages (1999). The language used depends on the language registered as the individual's mother tongue. Even though the term by which they are referred to is “national language”, as per these regulations they should both be expected to function as “official languages”. The languages are nominally equal at national level. This so-called individual bilingualism is complemented by territorial bilingualism in that municipalities are designated either bilingual or monolingual and are obliged to organize their services accordingly. Municipalities are designated bilingual if the minority speakers in that municipality make up at least eight percent of the population, or at least 3000 individuals. About a third of the population lives in bilingual municipalities (cf. Council of Europe 2010, p. 5), while at the time of writing there were three monolingually Swedish ones.

The make-up of the population by linguistic groups has changed quite considerably during the past century. The earliest census differentiating by language took place in 1880 and found 14.3% of the population to be Swedish-speaking. The

most significant decline took place in the 1950s, primarily due to emigration to Sweden and the more rapid growth in the Finnish-speaking population (cf. Finnäs 2013, p. 7). In 2013, Swedish-speakers made up around 5.3 percent of the population, roughly equal to that of speakers of neither Swedish nor Finnish (Statistics Finland 2014). The 20th century also saw an increasing geographic concentration of Swedish-speakers (cf. Finnäs 2013, p. 9).

In addition to making up a decreasing share of the population and living in increasing geographic concentration, Swedish-speakers in Finland are characterized by another important development: The prevalence of bilingualism. In 2009, 56% of those registered as Swedish-speakers identified as bilingual, compared to only 4% of those registered as Finnish-speakers (Gallup Finland 2009)⁵. The Swedish People's Party passed a special "Programme for the Bilinguals of Finland" in 2006. They warn most importantly of the impact that increasing individual bilingualism might have on societal bilingualism:

"The fact that a person also knows Finnish does not mean that authorities should have the right to stop offering services like social and health care in Swedish. The Swedish People's Party stresses that growing bilingualism does not change the right to Swedish-language services."⁶ (Swedish People's Party 2006).

Similarly, Salo (2012, p. 36) also remarks that nominal bilingualism is not enough to maintain functional bilingualism as "bilingual institutions and organizations tend to become monolingually Finnish rather rapidly without any conscious effort". It does appear that official status alone is not enough to ascertain usage in line with that status. This discrepancy can be explained by norms of language usage which in turn are shaped by language valuations.

⁵ This data comes from a paper as of yet unpublished by Laszlo Vincze from the University of Helsinki (laszlo.vincze@helsinki.fi), who provided me with it during a lecture and later gave me permission to use it in this paper.

⁶ Translation by author. Original reads: „Det att en person även kan finska betyder inte att myndigheterna skulle ha rätt att underlåta att erbjuda service så som social- och hälsovård på svenska. Sfp betonar att en ökad tvåspråkighet inte förändrar rätten till svenskspråkig service.“

Representatives of Swedish-speakers in the latest Report on the Application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages state that “in their view, the situation of the Swedish language had worsened during the reporting period and it is increasingly difficult to contact the authorities in Swedish” (Council of Europe 2010, p. 20). Finnish-speakers' level of Swedish is stated to “not match the standards that are set in order to ensure the linguistic rights of the citizens” (ibid.) (cf. also Sajavaara 2006, p.14). This decreasing competency in Swedish among Finnish-speakers explains scholarly interest in the reasons behind the performance outcomes of Swedish instruction, and highlights why the question of mandatory vs. elective status of the language is often being considered primarily in relation to how it impacts students' performance in Swedish, as the latter has an immediate impact on the linguistic rights of Swedish-speakers.

The second national language is currently a compulsory subject in both secondary school and university. As per the current core curriculum for basic education, instruction of the first compulsory language, the so-called A1-language, usually begins in grade three of comprehensive school and can be chosen freely (depending, of course, on the languages offered by the school). In 2010, 90.5 percent of students chose English as their A1 language (cf. Finnish National Board of Education 2011, p. 49). Swedish is usually started as the second compulsory (B1) language, which is currently being started in seventh grade. In 2010, 83% of students studying Swedish began their studies of the language in grade seven (cf. Finnish National Board of Education 2011, p. 52).

“Second national language” was a compulsory subject in Finland's only standardized nation-wide and high-stakes exam at the end of upper secondary school until 2004, when it was moved to elective status after lengthy discussion. Since then, students' interest in the voluntary exam has increasingly been perceived as problematically low, as the number of students taking the exam has continuously decreased, e.g. from 90 percent in the year the compulsory exam was abolished to 66 percent in 2010 (Matriculation Examination Board 2010). This change in regulation thus further increased interest in the question of Finnish students' motivation in learning the language, the focus being on how motivation impacts language acquisition and how

it can be improved (c.f. e.g. Kajander 2010, Green-Vänttinen, Korkman & Lehti-Eklund 2010). The government launched and supported projects to increase interest in the second national language and update language instruction policy. Notable examples are the KIEPO project (Language Instruction Policy Project, 2005-2007), TOKI project (Development Project for the Second National Language, 2007-2010) or the Svenska I Toppen project (2008-2010).

The second national language is also a compulsory exam at university required for graduation. This is referred to as “civil servants' [Swedish/Finnish]”, which stems from the fact that publicly regulated professions, particularly higher-ranking ones (civil servants, medical field) come with language requirements regarding the second national language which can be demonstrated by means of this exam. It usually involves taking a number of Swedish classes depending on the student's (self-assessed) level of need before demonstrating the required skill level in a final exam which tests for skills related to later professional practice (cf. Turun Yliopiston Kielikeskus n.d.).

To complement this background information, some words should also be devoted to where this study was conducted: Turku is a coastal city in Southwest Finland, and Finland's sixth largest by population. The population was 182.000 in 2013, of whom 5.4% were registered Swedish-speakers (up from 5.1% in 1990) (cf. Turun Kaupunki 2015). Turku is thus representative of the national average. Bilingualism in Turku appears to be widespread among native Swedish-speakers. For instance, the Swedish People's Party estimates that “in Turku, [...] two-thirds of students [in Swedish-language schools] are suspected to be bilingual.”⁷ (Swedish People's Party 2006).

During the researcher's stay in the city, local educational authorities had just decided to abolish the option for students of taking voluntary earlier Swedish (A2-language). This change was repeatedly mentioned in conjunction with coverage of the citizens' initiative in local sources and also brought up by many of the participating school teachers. Swedish instruction was thus a current issue in Turku in all of two ways

⁷ Translation by author. Original reads: „I Åbo, [...] två tredjedelar av eleverna uppskattas vara tvåspråkiga.“

at the time of writing, which clearly illustrates that the question of the correct extent and manner of instruction of Swedish has gone beyond being a school-internal issue only, and moved into general public discussion space. I shall now turn to identifying the primary macro-level discourses that mark this public discussion.

4.2 “Making Swedish an Elective Subject at all Levels of Instruction” and Macro-level Discourses in the Discussion on Swedish Acquisition Policy

The citizens' initiative at the backdrop of this thesis, titled “Making Swedish an elective subject at all levels of instruction” was initiated in March 2013 by the Association of Finnish Culture and Identity, the Language Choice Society, and the youth organizations of the True Finns Party and the National Coalition Party. It requested both the abolition of mandatory Swedish instruction as well as the abolition of language requirements in public office. At the time of its submission to parliament in April 2014, the initiative had a little over 62,000 signatures out of 50,000 required for submission. It was forwarded for discussion to the Education and Culture Committee in May 2014, which in February 2015 pronounced itself in its report of recommendation opposed to the initiative. At this stage, the motion also became accompanied by a suggestion requesting the next government “clarify the legal conditions for regional experiments for broadening options in choice of language without having the second national language be compulsory”⁸ (Parliament of Finland 2015). The Finnish parliament then rejected the initiative in March 2015 with a vote of 134 to 48 in what had frequently been predicted to turn into a close call. However, it voted in favour of the enclosed suggestion by the committee, which was most frequently interpreted to aim at enabling Finland's easternmost municipalities to allow students to replace studies of Swedish with studies of Russian.

⁸ Translation by author. Original reads: „selvittää lainsäädännölliset edellytykset alueellisiin kokeiluihin kielivalikoiman laajentamiseksi ilman velvoittavaa toisen kansalliskielen opiskelua“

This is by no means the first time mandatory Swedish has been called into question. In fact, the discussion on the position of the second national language (read: Swedish) in education can be traced back to the 1930s, back then connected to Finnish nationalism and foreign-policy conflict with Sweden. It died down during the days of the Cold War only to re-emerge in the late 1980s, bolstered by a *détente* in Finnish relations with Russia, European integration and globalization. This period also coined the still widely-circulated term “obligatory Swedish” (Finnish: *pakkoruotsi*, Swedish: *tvångssvenska*) (cf. Bruun 2015). The discussion now flares up at regular intervals. For instance, the above-mentioned removal of Swedish from its status as a compulsory subject in the high school graduation exam was not only of scholarly interest regarding the efficacy of language learning, but also accompanied by extensive public debate on the role of Swedish in public education.

Still, the citizens' initiative marks a climax moment in Finland's long-standing discussion on the position of Swedish as a school subject: For the first time in history, the question of elective Swedish had actually made it to the stage of parliamentary voting. During the discussion on the initiative, views were advanced that questioned both the institutional as well as the social circumstances of Swedish instruction: For instance, a party pamphlet called mandatory Swedish instruction “oppressive of Finnish-speakers in relation to Swedish-speakers”⁹ (Mahlamäki 2014), calling into question the social circumstances in opposition to the equality that the constitution mandates. Compulsory Swedish was also termed “language slavery. Slavery means forcing people to do something against their will”¹⁰ (Helling 2014) in opposition to the state's institutional mandate of determining mandatory language instruction. The perceived significance of this particular instance of the language discussion is also illustrated in the oft-repeated sentiment among supporters of mandatory Swedish instruction that a decision in favour of Swedish might serve to end the debate or at least have it abate for a longer period of time (cf. e.g. Landor 2015).

⁹ Translation by author. Original reads: „sortaa suomenkielisiä suhteessa ruotsinkielisiin“

¹⁰ Translation by author. Original reads: „språkslaveri. Slaveri betyder att människor tvingas göra något mot sin vilja.“

It is little surprise that views on Swedish instruction connect to developments in Finnish (language) education as a whole and to discourses on the latter. From the beginning, but particularly during the reform of comprehensive school in the 1960s, discussion on language education in Finland primarily has revolved around the question of how to diversify the nation's language skills (cf. Sajavaara 2006). Against this backdrop, Sajavaara (2006, p. 4) calls the compulsory status of the second national language in the present-day school system the outcome of “political armwrestling”¹¹, a solution not accounting for political and educational policy considerations. According to Sajavaara (2006), mandatory Swedish was formally set in place to safeguard bilingualism but justified to the population by arguments of Nordic cooperation and potential employment in other Nordic countries. On the other hand, the second national language had also been a compulsory subject in secondary education before the school reform of the 1960s. One of the reasons for the renegotiation may be the shift in what was considered the goal of language education over time, away from a humanist ideal stressing general education over the emphasis on usefulness of language in actual interaction (starting in the 1960s) and finally towards an individualized conception of learning aims that puts emphasis on students' goals (cf. Sajavaara 2006, p. 2, Nikula et al. 2010, p. 37). Over time, there has thus been significant change in conceptions of what makes a language valuable, and starting in the late 1980s “learners' individual positions have come to the fore in setting the objectives [of language instruction]”¹² (Sajavaara 2006, p. 3).

A prominent Discourse that has influenced education in Finland and is also clearly reflected in the discussion on mandatory Swedish is the marketisation Discourse. In the case of Finland, Simola, Rinne and Kivirauma (2001) locate this Discourse by analysing narratives on Finnish educational reforms. Among the most prominent changes in the Finnish system subject to changing discourses on education are said to be students' option of choosing their school, as well as the individualization of the contents of studies via instruments such as the personal study plan. There are clear links between

¹¹ Translation by author. Original reads „poliittinen kädenväännön tulo[s]“

¹² Translation by author. Original reads „kieliä opiskelevien henkilökohtaiset lähtökohdat nousta esiin tavoitteiden asettelussa“

these then-new forms of governance and the role of students and parents in the statements by national-level actors. Recent changes in the education system are repeatedly described as marked by “market-based thinking”, “renaissance of individuality”, “freedom of choice” and as an “educational policy which emphasises the student's responsibility” (all Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 71). Students and parents are characterized as “users of services” or “clients”, whereas organizing education is “production of services that take into account citizens' needs” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 85). Simola, Rinne and Kivirauma (2001, p. 73) conclude that “marketisation discourse has changed the way we speak about schooling”.

At the same time “very few school-level actors spoke about education in marketing terms. The marketing rhetoric used by some of the state-level actors was unfamiliar and foreign to most of the school-level actors.” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 73). The authors further regard it as problematic that “the teacher is increasingly an absent presence in the discourses of education policy, an object rather than a subject of discourse” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 96), somebody to implement decisions made at higher level due also to influences that transcend the individual country's borders. One finds these absent presences in the discussion on mandatory Swedish as well, such as when the vice speaker of the Language Choice Society suggests in response to the issue that job posts for Swedish teachers would halve were the initiative to be adopted, that “they could teach other languages and other subjects”¹³ (Tapiola 2014). There is thus distinct merit in shifting the focus to the stage of implementation.

In addition, there are also distinct Discourses that relate to the status of Swedish in particular. According to Sajavaara (2006), having both Finnish and Swedish as compulsory subjects is usually argued for in terms of equality. Other arguments reference academic and social importance (e.g. understanding Finnish history, enabling Nordic cooperation, sharing a border with Sweden, and appealing to a shared cultural heritage), but Sajavaara (2006, p. 14) regards those critically as “their significance is

¹³ Translation by author. Original reads „He voisivat opettaa muita kieliä ja muita oppiaineita“

difficult to understand from the students' own standpoint”¹⁴. This begs the question of the extent to which they can be used in in-classroom language legitimization. Similarly, professional language requirements are perceived by Sajavaara as motivators for learning in higher education, but as less relevant in secondary school and thus less conducive to improved performance at this level of education because of their inaccessibility to students at that age.

Hult and Pietikäinen (2014), in studying the ideologies around the position of Swedish in Finland as expressed in its two major newspapers during 2010, observe a cyclical nature to the debate as well as a number of established interdiscursive links. This is in line with the pattern observed by Salo (2010a, p. 355) regarding the discussion on the position of Swedish in education in general:

“Often, these debates [on the sensibleness of learning Swedish] remain at the level of insistence, as both those in favor of learning Swedish as well as the supporters of its abolition do not take a stance on each other's arguments, but repeat their own as the only correct opinions to have.”¹⁵.

This repetitive character also applies to the diachronic perspective (cf. Bruun 2015). These points serve as justification for viewing established discourses in Finland's language discussion as per Alvesson and Kärreman's (2000) model as Discourse with a capital D and therefore as discursive backdrop to local textual practices. They have become “culturally standardised discourses that are associated with particular social settings” (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000, p. 1134), i.e. with Finland's present-day linguistic market.

Following Hult and Pietikäinen (2014), it is possible to identify several “sociopolitical ideals” (Blommaert 1999, p. 2) and resulting valuations expressed in the Discourses associated with positions on both sides of the fence: For elective Swedish, these are the neoliberal Discourse which values freedom of choice, and the globalist Discourse which values language offering “access to the world economy and global mobility” (Hult & Pietikäinen 2014, p. 10) and frames language in economic terms. The

¹⁴ Translation by author. Original reads „[...] merkitystä oppilaiden on omalla kohdallaan vaikea ymmärtää“

¹⁵ Translation by author. Original reads: „Usein nämä keskustelut tahtovat jäädä inttämisen asteelle, sillä niin ruotsin opettamisen puolustajat kuin sen lakkauttamista kannattavat eivät juurikaan ota kantaa toistensa argumentteihin, vaan toistavat omia, ainoina oikeina pitämiään mielipiteitä.“

first Discourse in particular draws on marketisation Discourse, as in both education is “made into a product for which the demand may direct the supply in liberated markets” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma, p. 94).

The position in support of mandatory Swedish is associated with a “language rights discourse” (Hult & Pietikäinen 2014, p. 9), both when it comes to choosing which language to learn and regarding the rights of Swedish-speakers to Swedish-language services. Supporters also tend to define the social value of Swedish not in utility as derived from number of speakers but in representing it as “a semiotic resource for national identity for the entire Finnish population” (Hult & Pietikäinen 2014, p. 13). One could term this an identity Discourse and augment it by adding the emphasis on Nordicism often found in arguments supporting mandatory Swedish. The latter Discourses have in common that they accord Swedish a special position outside linguistic market rules as expressive of identity and illustrative of equality.

The major Discourse that is shared by both camps is what I would term utility Discourse, which values practical application of acquired knowledge. The difference between supporters and opponents of mandatory Swedish here lies in how utility Discourse is used as a resource differently by defining social reality differently, portraying for instance the global economy as more important than the Nordic economy or the other way around.

Regarding the two different types of value identified in 2.1 (instrumentalist vs. romantic), *Hufvudstadsbladet* concluded that between 2000-2009 a shift in the atmosphere of the debate had taken place, making Swedish “a language among others”¹⁶ (qtd. in Green-Vänttinen, Korkman & Lehti-Eklund 2010, p. 10). This assessment would lead one to suspect that values outside those formed in a neoliberal linguistic market could no longer be claimed for Swedish and that the debate is now dominated by invoking instrumentalist values. While this finds confirmation in the importance of utility Discourse, it is slightly at odds with Hult and Pietikäinen's (2014) findings who still see a tension between the types of value. However, the two assessments can probably be reconciled by stating that the shift has not been complete, rather indicating

¹⁶ Translation by author. Original reads „språk bland andra“

a tendency. In any case, marketisation discourse and its emphasis on personal utility to be established in a neoliberal linguistic market appear to have thoroughly changed the discussion on mandatory Swedish instruction.

Hult and Pietikäinen (2014, p. 13) conclude that Finland's language ideological “brought to light conflicts about the fundamental social value of Swedish in Finland”. The above-mentioned tendency towards devolution in education “will leave the conflicts to be dealt with at a lower level of the system” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma, p. 97), i.e. in individual schools, among teachers and families. The above-mentioned relative absence of teachers from educational discourse leaves one with uncharted territory of how mandatory Swedish is taught at a time of competing notions of what education should do, and why. Before I attempt to alleviate this gap in existing research, I shall turn my attention to the role of Swedish teachers in language legitimization in general.

4.3 Language and Policy Legitimization in Swedish Instruction

Finnish teachers have a large scope of action in reflecting on the aims of instruction and estimating how the latter can be reached (cf. Uusikylä & Atjonen 2007, p. 62). Since national guidelines are rather general, local education authorities, principals and teachers all participate in curriculum development and planning (cf. Sahlberg 2011, p. 89) and universities are autonomous legal entities. Due to lack of external assessment and standardized testing and absence of strict learning outcome goals, “determining students' personal and cognitive progress is regarded as a responsibility of the school, not of external assessments or assessors” (Sahlberg 2011, p. 89). Teachers are thus important actors in the policy implementation process and can influence it through their own approaches. Teacher education reflects this large range of tasks – Finland has one of the most competitive, practically-oriented and research-based teacher education systems in the world (cf. Mallinen, Väisänen & Savolainen 2012). University language teachers also follow this path of language teacher training. The

large scope of autonomy makes it particularly important to study implementation processes at the local level.

Though curriculum guidelines and their principles are kept quite general, it is still possible to identify Bourdieu's "schemes of perception, thought, appreciation and action" (Bourdieu 1977, p. 35) as regards value of Swedish as per official principles. For instance, the current core curriculum for upper-secondary school states that learning Swedish offers students "opportunities to develop their knowledge, understanding and appreciation of Nordic society and culture" (Finnish National Board of Education 2003, p. 84). Finland is "a Nordic state within Europe" (ibid. 87) and a bilingual country which rightfully entails linguistic rights and obligations. In addition to learning the language itself, students also need to know "how to communicate in a manner characteristic of the Swedish language and its cultural area" (ibid.). Swedish is also portrayed as a springboard for gaining awareness of cultural relativity. Beyond the instrumentalist value inherent in any modern language education, there is thus a clear identity dimension to these principles as well as an emphasis on the legitimacy of state bilingualism. The principles of the university-level official exam appear more practically oriented, in that "subject areas and language usage aims are simulated in different situations connected to work"¹⁷ (Finnish National Board of Education 2004¹⁸). National language requirements thus follow the language legitimization pattern outlined by Bourdieu, increasing language value by establishing its usage in official domains. These principles also normalize the functioning of Swedish as an official language, providing a pattern of both perception and action.

Swedish teachers' professional practices have previously been examined primarily in relation to students' learning outcomes rather than their own goals. Some remarks can still be made on the basis of literature reviewed: According to Green-

¹⁷ Translation by author. Original reads „Aihealueita ja kielenkäyttötarkoituksia simuloidaan erilaisissa työhön liittyvissä kielenkäyttötilanteissa“

¹⁸ The actual exams at university level will differ across subject areas since they are explicitly connected to graduates' future fields of employment. These should thus be taken as very general principles that apply to all exams at this level.

Vänttinen, Korkman and Lehti-Eklund (2010), the most common goals of successful Swedish teachers are providing mastery in Swedish of everyday situations and professional life, passing on knowledge about Swedish-language and Nordic culture, encouraging students to discover new cultures and improving students' attitudes to Swedish. The closest goal to explicit language legitimization provided here is voiced by a teacher stating that students “should think that it is appropriate to learn Swedish”¹⁹ (Green-Vänttinen, Korkman & Lehti-Eklund 2010, p. 23), but it is brought up by one person only. I would, however, expect that many of the informants subsumed this point under “improving students' attitudes”.

As per Salo (2010b), only a small minority of Swedish teachers regard themselves as “just like any other teacher”²⁰, reflecting limited permeation of neoliberal market conceptions where Swedish is a language like any other. On the other hand, this self-attribution of a special position could also stem from the extent to which the status of Swedish instruction is a subject of public discussion. This is lent credence by the fact that teachers are also reported to see themselves as implementing agents in teaching a compulsory subject, putting them in a unique position where they are forced to work against negative attitudes and prejudices. Other teachers experience this role as agents more positively, describing themselves for instance as “a representative of the revivalist movement who fights on the side of the Nordic values”²¹ or as “a champion of Nordicness”²² (both Salo 2010b).

Common to these latter descriptions is that Swedish teachers indeed appear to teach more than a language but as introduced in my distinction perceptions, thoughts and appreciation, here for instance perception of Nordicness as a defining characteristic and appreciation for this part of Finland's identity. These are thus clear examples of teachers who regard legitimization as their task, but they do not apply to all the teachers in the study and are not phrased as examples of language legitimization.

¹⁹ Translation by author. Original reads „[...] ska tycka att de går an att studera svenska“

²⁰ Translation by author. Original reads: „kuin kuka tahansa muukin opettaja“

²¹ Translation by author. Original reads: „herätysliikkeen edustaja, joka taistelee pohjoismaisten arvojen puolesta“

²² Translation by author. Original reads: „pohjoismaisuuden esitaistelijana“

How can the goal of language legitimization be reached? As per Salo (2010a), arguments drawn on in instruction that could be subsumed under the header of legitimization in line with the definition established in the theoretical framework are geographical proximity or similarities between Finnish and Swedish to demonstrate similarities in the two cultures' worlds of thought. Salo (2011, p. 60) consequently finds that out of the Swedish teachers participating in his study “a third regards the cultural perspective as particularly important in Swedish instruction”²³. Culture serves a legitimizing function in that Swedish can be presented as providing “a bridge to Nordic culture”²⁴ and “opening doors to other Nordic countries”²⁵ (both Salo 2011, p. 60). These are romantic notions of language value. They appear to be more relevant at school level while university instruction is more focused on later professional practice and connects to language requirements.

However, in school instruction as well, instrumentalist value notions play an important role in language legitimization: As per Green-Vänttinen, Korkman and Lehti-Eklund (2010, p. 47), Swedish teachers should “make students realize why they go to school, why they study Swedish, and get them to be glad about that which they are learning”²⁶ – i.e. to regard the fact that they are learning Swedish as appropriate. To achieve this, teachers in their study draw on students' own goals and views on the usefulness of studying Swedish to achieve results (cf. 2010, 25), stressing primarily instrumentalist notions of value. There thus appears to be a certain tension between the emphasis on romantic value notions found in teachers' self-described roles and the instrumentalist value notions predominantly used in the classroom. Additionally, using instrumentalist notions requires that centrally set goals and notions can be reconciled with those of students without major trade-offs. Central to this are, among other things, the current language requirements which teachers can use to remind students of their need for Swedish skills in the future (cf. Green-Vänttinen, Korkman & Lehti-Eklund

²³ Translation by author. Original reads „Noin kolmasosa [...] pitää kulttuurinäkökulmaa erityisen tärkeänä ruotsin opettamisessa“

²⁴ Translation by author. Original reads „silta pohjoismaiseen kulttuuriin“

²⁵ Translation by author. Original reads „avaa ovet muihin pohjoismaihin“

²⁶ Translation by author. Original reads „få eleverna att inse varför de går i skola, varför de läser svenska och få dem att vara glada över de som de lär sig“

2010, p. 42) as well as the close ties with Sweden e.g. in business and academic life. It is therefore paramount to examine how legitimization as a task is experienced in a discursive setting that calls into question both the importance of romantic notions of language value (what I have termed utility Discourse above) and the legitimacy of state primacy in the linguistic market (via neoliberal Discourse and globalist Discourse).

Improved performance, particularly in settings relevant to students, appears to be the primary goal in Swedish instruction as reported by teachers. At upper-secondary school level and university level, instruction is also directed by the contents and requirements of the final exam, pushing the focus in instruction towards that which is covered in exams (cf. Sahlberg 2011, p. 25). Still, language legitimization appears to play a part in teachers' (self-reported) work, believed to help in improving performance, attitudes and motivation.

It is presumed that Discourses have an impact at local level: For instance, Salo (2010a) comes to the conclusion that generally prevailing attitudes towards Swedish matter. One teacher expresses their frustration as “try and explain it then, the point in teaching and learning [Swedish]”²⁷ (2010 a, p. 362). Teachers express that students are influenced by the larger social context, becoming indifferent or even opposed to learning Swedish from the beginning on. Teachers also report feeling constrained by media discourses, and even their colleagues' or superiors' attitudes. Along similar lines, Green-Vänttinen, Korkmann and Lehti-Eklund (2010) also find that societal discourses support or take away from students' motivation and teachers' enthusiasm. Teachers express regret and frustration in the face of societal discourses and would like for the school to support them in their work. Swedish, they believe, requires different treatment than other languages because shared history invokes both positive and negative associations. It is thus worthwhile to examine the impact of moments of heightened legitimacy contest and to devote separate study to the impact of Discourse on language legitimization – independent of learning outcomes. The following analysis does so by departing from teachers' own views on, and experiences with, language legitimization in

²⁷ Translation by author. Original reads „Perustelee siinä sitten opettamisen ja oppimisen hyödyllisyyttä”

order to examine the impact of legitimacy contest on their work without involving student performance as a variable.

5 ANALYSIS

The analysis of my empirical material is structured by the research questions, discussed in the order in which they have been presented above. Patterns discovered during examination of the empirical material will be illustrated with representative quotes taken from the interviews, and repeated reference will be made to the theoretical framework in explaining them. At the end of each sub-chapter, a summarizing paragraph will present the main findings.

5.1 The Role of Swedish Teachers in Language Legitimization

The task of language legitimization in the present-day Finnish setting bears potential for a significant ideological dilemma (for how these can be inherent in roles, see Stanley and Billig 2004, pp. 161 f.): On the one hand, Swedish instruction as per the curriculum is connected to a number of understandings that legitimize the status of the subject and can be considered as reflective of the state's position (see 2.3). Language legitimization as delegated to public education institutions assumes passing on these understandings of linguistic market structure and by extension the values attached to them. On the other hand, the marketization of education stresses individual goals based on individual values and the idea that pedagogic supply should follow demand, going against the idea of centrally directed demand via value imposition.

A few participants directly or indirectly mentioned the shift to individualization as a general development in the setting of their work, with evaluations predominantly negative. For instance, Silja reports that she increasingly struggles with students refusing to participate fully and attributes this to an overarching change in society, saying that

“the whole uhm society change this individual freedom and individual. We can't know, it's more stressed, this individuality. That you have all those rights to say no, if you don't like something you don't have to do it. It's more and more like that. [...] Before it was like, teacher said you do this. But now the teachers don't require that you present some things to the other people in the class. I don't know. And we have also become a little, uhm, you know careful with what we demand from the pupils. We feel we don't have the same rights anymore to demand something. It's almost like I have no rights to demand that they do their homework anymore.”

As someone with more than twenty years of experience teaching, Silja appears to have a naturalized conception of what the role of a teacher is. Her experience leads to the emergence of common-sense understandings, probably most apparent in her dissatisfaction with the homework situation visible in her phrasing. This understanding on her part has increasingly been challenged by present experiences, and as we learn from the rest of the interview, students' and parents' behaviour which reflect the new common-sense understanding of individualization. Silja appears uncertain as to how to resolve this dilemma, but also dissatisfied with the solution of teachers simply demanding less in order to avoid conflict because it conflicts with her understanding of teachers having a certain authority. This authority to impose is what language legitimization needs to draw on in order to exist in spite of reservations or even refusal among students to accept understandings other than their own (or those of others they subscribe to voluntarily). This forebodes how marketization Discourse and its associated understandings such as individuality and economic primacy might have an impact on language legitimization practices and outcomes.

I will now move on to the analysis of teachers' views on and experiences with actual language legitimization. There generally is a lot of variation across participants in many respects, deriving as well from the different settings in which they work (e.g. a school with a language focus vs. a science focus, university classes in practical Swedish for medical students or voluntary classes for the weakest students to prepare for the compulsory Swedish exam). Because of these differences, which would have to be accounted for, it is impossible to develop a full classification of attitudes and approaches because they are all dependent on the context of instruction and a qualitative study with a small sample size is not suited for finding generalizable patterns.

It is, however, sufficient to establish that there is a consensus among participants that their task as a teacher of Swedish goes beyond mere improving of language skills, albeit to different extents. The questionnaire used in interviews suggested five additional tasks for participants to evaluate as to the extent to which they were considered their own tasks. The items in question were “students developing an interest in Swedish-language culture”, “improving students' readiness to use Swedish in their everyday life”, “improving students' attitudes towards Swedish”, “making students understand the reasons for Finland's bilingualism” and “making students understand why they need to know Swedish”. These items can all be considered part of language legitimization as derived from the theoretical framework. The item “improving language skills” was the only one that all participants considered to be their task without major reservations. Additional items were considered tasks both because of participants' job description (i.e. delegated tasks) as well as tasks taken on because of participants' personal belief in their value (i.e. self-assigned tasks). It is impossible to make a clear distinction since there is significant overlap between the two.

The detailed picture is very complex. To begin with, there is a certain difference between university teachers and school teachers in the extent to which they consider explaining the reasons for Finnish bilingualism to be their task as a Swedish teacher, with school teachers more likely to consider it a task. For instance, Mirjami, who works at university, explicitly relegates this task to school level by saying

“I mean 'making students understand the reasons for Finland's bilingualism' is more for traditional school and high school where you talk about bilingualism and try to get the students aware of the, you know, how things are in Finland. I think they already know quite a lot about that.”

Mirjami however still appears to think that it is important that her students not only learn Swedish but also that they are aware of reasons why they have to do so. She also appears to have reason to believe that her students are already aware of the structures that make Finland a bilingual country. Aino argues in a different manner why she does not consider this her task, saying that “after all, it's not me who decided that Finland is a bilingual country. That's a political question”. This goes against the theoretical framework's assumption of teachers as state agents who pass on the valuations inherent

in the outcomes of exactly those political questions. Instead, Aino aims at students finding the classes pleasant and enjoyable by functioning as a role model herself – a motivating approach as per my theoretical distinction introduced above. This approach is not linked to notions of language value. Though outside the scope of this thesis, goals that could be subsumed under “motivating” find recurrent emphasis, with participants wanting their students to enjoy classes and to experience learning success.

While school teachers were more likely to consider explaining the value of Swedish in Finland as a task, there is a certain variation in the extent to which legitimization is made a task in practice among participants who teach in school as there are a number of practical obstacles. Asked how she explains to students that knowledge of Swedish is important for Finnish students, Kamilla for instance enumerates the Swedish test at university and the language requirements in many jobs (structures that significantly contribute to language value as per the theoretical framework and are thus classical elements of language legitimization), before going on to say

“Of course I also try to say that we're a Nordic country and this is our common language, but I am so honest, I don't speak about that much anymore, I just let it be as it is. That's somehow hopeless there there, so I don't have time to motivate them like that. I think that if they're not motivated now, what am I supposed to do then. They just absolutely have to come to class (laughs)”

Kamilla also says that she outlines to reluctant students with a very negative attitude to Swedish classes the minimum requirements for passing the class in order to incentivize them to work to meet them, saying that passing then becomes the students' “main motivation”. This removes any form of value transmission from instruction because here no further understandings are attached e.g. to why tests should be passed – they simply have to be passed so the student in question can graduate. This decision on the one hand connects to Kamilla's work experience in that she has not experienced discussing these language valuing structures as useful (I will return to this point further below). On the other hand, it also has to do with how Kamilla does not necessarily see opposition to the Swedish classes as opposition to the language per se:

“I accept that, that not everyone is interested. [...] But it's a good question where that comes from then. If they have some kinds of problems there with studying, with writing, that's also possible. But the problem is, I can't treat them individually. Unfortunately, I just have to leave them be then.”

Students struggling with the classes thus does not have to be an outcome of them not valuing knowledge of Swedish but can happen for a myriad of reasons that value transmission cannot fix. Due to large groups, high test requirements and lack of time, teachers do not always have the option of finding out where problems in students' attitude to Swedish class stem from and whether they would require more of a motivating or more of a legitimizing approach. Kamilla then chooses this approach for how it enables her to cover the main points she has to cover and because in her experience it leads to the largest number of students passing the compulsory class.

The issue of lack of time was recurrent in connection with the additional tasks provided in the questionnaire. Both participants working in secondary education and in higher education described the requirements of the respective final exam as difficult, sometimes too difficult. They have to focus on teaching exactly those language skills that will be required in the final exam, and while they all state they are very free in deciding how this is to be implemented, they also agree that the requirements are limiting as to the aims and contents of instruction (for this washback effect in language instruction in Finland, cf. Nikula et al. 2010, p. 35 and Sahlberg 2011, p. 25). Additionally, some participants work in structures where several teachers “share” a class, meaning the first teacher teaches during one period before the next teacher takes over the class for the next period, so that they have to make sure they cover everything foreseen by the curriculum before the next teacher takes over.

Participants tend to deplore this situation, both because they feel like it makes their work more stressful and because lack of time makes it difficult for them to teach content they think students might be interested in or that might be useful to them in later life but which is not covered in the exam. The most common examples of what participants would like to be able to put more emphasis on for this reason are application and assessment of oral Swedish skills and cultural instruction. Participants raise these points both because they believe this content would be useful to students in their daily and later life and because some students themselves have expressed an interest in it, indicating emphasis on language utility and individualization of instruction.

One also finds this emphasis on individual utility by examining shortly the representations that participants brought up as ways of achieving with students the five additional tasks (outside improving language skills) that the questionnaire presented. It needs to be stressed that this term in no way implies “distortion”. Rather, debates on language value assume that social reality needs to be defined and constructed (cf. Blommaert 1999, p. 9). These should thus rather be conceived of as putting emphasis on certain aspects of social reality in order to contribute to defining students' lived environment.

Beyond motivating practices (which all participants state to use, to different extents, but which are not characterized by this redefinition of social reality) the following points were all raised by at least two participants as ways of changing students' views on Swedish: Several participants get students to encounter Swedish in their immediate environs, for instance by having them take pictures of Swedish-language street signs or taking a museum tour in Swedish in order to portray the language as useful. Participants also like to stress their own personal experiences, or to tell anecdotes of acquaintances or family members who have ended up needing Swedish in spite of their initial assumptions to the contrary. They often stress the need for Swedish skills in working life (or at upper-secondary school level, the university exam in Swedish). A few participants state that they like to incorporate Swedish-language cultural elements that they assume to be interesting to students. They also draw on similarities between e.g. Swedish and German, or point out how Swedish helps in learning other Scandinavian languages, another example of instrumentalist value of Swedish.

The relative concentration on instrumentalist notions regarding the value of Swedish is not surprising: Instrumentalist notions appear to be more accessible and easier to understand for students, and the majority of changes in students' attitudes to the Swedish classes that participants identify are connected to realizations as to the instrumentalist value of Swedish. This applies for instance to Kristiina's students' having to interact with Swedish-speakers not proficient in either Finnish or English within the framework of their classes in a manner that mirrors their probable future professional

activity. This emphasis on instrumentalist value mirrors the apparent emphasis in the discussion at macro-level.

It also appears that differences in legitimization practices can to some extent be attributed to expected reactions to and consequences of discussions on the value of Swedish and the use of learning the language. For instance, Aino, asked about how she goes about improving students' attitudes to the compulsory Swedish class reports that "If someone has a bad attitude, and I try to forcefully change that, then it certainly gets even more negative." Instead, she tries to set a positive example by having a positive attitude herself, saying that it can be awkward for negative students to persist in their attitude in the face of her own enthusiasm about the classes. Similarly, Mirjami says that she points out to students that learning something is easier with a positive attitude, going on to say "But otherwise I try not to speak for Swedish that much. Because you know it might, it might disturb someone. Irritate. [...] Cause I don't want to start the discussion about the usefulness of Swedish."

Both express a fear that an explicit discussion of different notions of language value would only worsen some students' attitudes. This might stem from concern that an in-classroom discussion might develop similar dynamics as those repeatedly described by participants for society at large: That the discussion would be dominated by a small but very vocal group of people with very negative attitudes while those with a positive or neutral attitude would represent a silent majority. This is reasonable to assume because both Aino and Mirjami also go on to say that their students' attitudes are overall very positive. For instance on the topic of people who explicitly question Swedish instruction, Aino says that

"generally in university people don't have bad attitudes to Swedish, most of them have a very positive attitude [...]. They are very interested in learning. So [students explicitly being negative] is really an exception"

Similarly, Mirjami fears that "there might be somebody who has strong opinions about that". Her use of the singular shows that she does not apply this assumption to a large number of students, but the presence of students with very negative attitudes (whom

they both reveal they have had experiences with throughout the interview) is enough to make her want to avoid the discussion altogether.

Similarly, some participants have found discussions on state bilingualism, including the question of mandatory Swedish, to be never-ending and thus not having a positive impact on students' attitudes but rather taking up time and leading to little change in views on Swedish. For instance, Pauliina says she does not want to discuss the status of Swedish because

“[...] the students either think it's wrong for them to have to study Swedish or it's okay. And there's always all sides. And if you go into that discussion in a group, so it never ends. You start something that never ends. “

Presenting the representations outlined above then appears to be the primary way in which participants think they can actually change students' views on Swedish. They also avoid the lengthy discussions repeatedly assumed to follow explicit discussions on language policy which participants tend to regard as ineffective.

A contrary case in her reaction to a discussion on the value of Swedish is, for instance, Sofia. Sofia states that there are times when, in addition to teaching grammar and vocabulary, she wants to “point out why [learning Swedish] is important” and that these are the moments when students will occasionally ask her why they have to learn Swedish to begin with. Sofia says on the ensuing discussions that “I accept it, and I welcome it, because of course the students have to have the possibility to say what they think and their opinions. And often they have very good arguments.” Sofia has made positive experiences discussing the value of Swedish and perceives these discussions as helpful in improving students' attitudes because they give her the opportunity to point out the contexts in which students will need Swedish.

Other participants consequently vary their approach to discussing the reasons for students needing to study Swedish by type of group they are teaching and their expectations as to whether such a discussion would yield reasonable arguments and better understanding among students for the need for Swedish. In this approach to language legitimization, the latter does not lead to vastly different value perceptions among students. For instance, Pauliina, who used to teach in lower-secondary school and now works at upper-secondary level, says:

“When I work with the [lower-secondary school], there I had that discussion [on why students have to learn Swedish] all the time [...] and then if you went into that discussion it never ended. [...] I don't like the discussion at all. Now [that I am teaching in upper-secondary school] I can take it up with the students who study A-Swedish sometimes because we are going through the newspapers and television. So I can take it up with them because they like Swedish, they are more to it that you have to have it. So it's easier, we don't have to discuss the whole lesson.”

Immense differences in setting thus make it difficult to find a general answer to the question of the extent to which teachers are agents in language legitimization in practice. I will continue to explore these differences in settings in answering the second research question.

In spite of these differences in context of instruction and in participants' views on what constitutes their task as Swedish teachers, there is one overwhelming consensus among all participants: That students' attitudes develop by themselves and students have to realize by themselves the value in learning Swedish, to the point where individualization of language value creation appears as a common-sense phenomenon. This applies to both instruction at school and at university level. Even Sofia with her openness to having discussions on the value of Swedish instruction makes a highly representative statement in saying that “the motivation comes from [students' own interest in Swedish]. I can't be the one who says you have to learn this, you know, they have to find the will to do it for themselves.”

In addition to motivating by remaining positive and leading by example in order to improve attitudes (an approach shared by all participants), teachers can thus also present certain aspects of the world which participants usually try to connect with students' own experiences and future activities in order to portray Swedish as a valuable resource for the individual student. Teachers are, however, unlikely to engage in what Bourdieu (1977, p. 47) calls “explicit pedagogy”, the instruction of “articulated and even formalized principles”. This is a very individualized view of language valuation, which all participants share – language values cannot be imposed, but they are created by students themselves. In how far representations become part of students' personal views of the linguistic market is often not discussed, be it because of suspected negative

consequences for students' attitudes, because discussions are not seen as useful or because the requirements in the standardized final exams are so high that they leave little time for anything but working on exactly those language skills required in the exam (the main obstacle raised by participants).

Teachers consequently see themselves as part of students' discursive environment and thus as having a part in constructing their language valuations. However, they do not accord themselves as central a position as does the theoretical framework: Participants see themselves as state agents in making sure that students reach the skill level required in the central exams, but this cannot be said all that fully about language legitimization where practical issues often stand in the way. Teachers can impact students' views, but the latter are not their sole responsibility since language valuations stem from many different sources among which teachers do not necessarily have a privileged position in their own view.

5.2 Swedish Teachers' Views on Language Valuation and the Language Debate

There are clear common patterns in participants' utterances on their own attitudes to Swedish and in their views on the language question. Unsurprisingly, participants tend to value Swedish highly, both for themselves and for the country as a whole. For themselves, they often say that they like the language, that they enjoyed learning it themselves and that it is interesting over its similarities to English and German. However, a small number of participants also say that their attitudes only became more positive over time.

Participants also tend to stress romantic value notions in their normative views on Finnish language acquisition policy more than is the case in the macro-level discourse. For instance, Silja explains her views on why compulsory Swedish makes more sense than compulsory Russian by stressing cultural similarities:

“It should be compulsory. Swedish. Because of the history and everything. The culture. It should still be compulsory in high school. [Silja raises opponents' argument that mandatory Swedish could be replaced by mandatory Russian on the basis of the shared history factor]. If you compare Russian culture with Finnish culture. [...] I was in Moscow, it was a good experience, but the culture is so different. So different. Compared to Swedish culture and Finnish. Like another world. So I don't know if we should.”

Silja clearly draws on identity Discourse to justify her point of view, arguing that cultural similarities should be a determining factor in a language's position in acquisition policy and presenting this connection as common sense. It is interesting that according to Silja opponents of mandatory Swedish capitalize on this identity Discourse by applying it to Russian in order to show its irrelevance. In order to reject this appropriation of identity Discourse, Silja operates with an understanding of culture in line with that of the theoretical framework: For Bourdieu, culture is a “symbolic system” that needs to be learned to be understood, a process that takes place in instruction where the cultural arbitrary is passed on. Silja here uses this understanding to legitimize Swedish: Learning Swedish, she says, helps understand the symbolic system of Finnish culture, a function that (presumably) no other language could fulfil.

Following a similar argumentation, Ronja says that

“I think Swedish in Finland [is] a Latin for Finnish people, in a way [...] So I think it's more, it's kind of, if you live in the coastline in Finland, I think you need Swedish anyways. If you live in other parts of Finland it's your background, it's your cultural background. So maybe you won't need it so much in your life perhaps, but you need to know something about it.”

Again, Ronja bases her view on language acquisition policy on romantic value notions, drawing on identity Discourse. She also explicitly rejects the idea of basing language acquisition policy entirely on notions of utility, going against the utility Discourse that currently dominates the public discussion and that also appears to dominate teachers' legitimization practices. Both Ronja and Silja accord Swedish a place outside neoliberal linguistic market structures, unlike current macro-level discourse is wont to do. In addition to referring to cultural similarities and Swedish as part of general knowledge to argue for their opinion, participants use Nordic cooperation, bilingualism as enriching, Swedish-speakers' linguistic rights, the relative easiness of learning Swedish and the extent to which Swedish helps in learning other languages. When asked for their

personal opinion, participants thus use identity Discourse, utility Discourse and to a certain extent language rights Discourse.

In my view, this relative personal attachment to romantic value notions is most clearly related to the identity category of being a language teacher. Subject positioning makes it clear that this is a category that participants overwhelmingly identify with. Sofia for instance makes the shared identity of language teachers and the associated (assumed) linguistic values as expressed in similar opinions explicit in saying that “language teachers have this, you know, we have same opinions because we think that languages are important, no matter what language we talk about”. She uses the “we”-pronoun not to identify with Swedish teachers, but with language teachers as a group. Livia's assessment of her colleagues' attitude is equally that “language teachers always care about all languages”. Both here accord all language teachers a subscription to notions of romantic language value – an instrumentalist notion would not hold that “all languages are important” because their importance would depend on the respective setting (e.g. on the number of people proficient in the language in question in a certain setting). Only in the romantic viewpoint do all languages have expanded meaning because they always carry a value beyond serving as an instrument of expression whose value rises and falls depending on the context.

In the interview with Silja, particular beliefs and by extension values deriving from the subject identity “language teacher” emerges as something amounting to common sense. Silja tells the story of a former teacher of Russian and English who now repeatedly writes to Turku newspapers commenting negatively on the status of Swedish as a school subject. Silja concludes this story by saying:

“All the time she's writing this, Swedish should be, you know, not compulsory, there should be Russian or whatever, some other languages, but not Swedish. [...] And I find it so strange. A language teacher is against some language, like she is. So it makes me so sad.”

Silja is clearly assuming that language teachers have an inherently different system for forming value, distinct from the linguistic market that appears socially dominant based on the public discussion around mandatory Swedish and which is characterized by a shift towards instrumentalist values, and she presents this difference as common sense

inherent in a language teacher's professional role by being noticeably baffled by the other teacher's attitude.

My own analysis of participants' personal opinions on language acquisition policy lends support to this view on participants' part: Their own views are characterized by romantic notions to a larger extent than are the understandings that emerge as central to the order of discourse at macro-level with its shift towards utility Discourse, which obviously draws on instrumentalist notions of value. This is line with the findings by Salo (2010a and 2010b). While most participants are not as explicit as Silja, only one participant, in spite of being personally quite attached to Swedish, explicitly states that she does not have a clear opinion on language acquisition policy. Thus, for most participants, it appears that language legitimization (to the extent that it is perceived as a task) is not only a delegated task, but also arises from personal views on what is valuable.

This discrepancy between personal values and the values expressed in dominant macro-level discourses can serve to explain participants' overwhelmingly negative views on the debate's content and the way it is conducted: Participants usually describe the discussion on compulsory Swedish as exhausting or aggravating. They often see it as dominated only by those who are the most vocally negative. Taken together, these factors help explain the central role self-identification as a language teacher plays for several of the participants. For instance, Kristiina replies, when asked about her conversations on the language discussion with her colleagues:

“K: We constantly talk about [the language discussion]. [...] You can't really avoid that. We would like to talk about something else but this is always

H: Because this is always so present

K: Yes. And each one of us has to work through that somehow, so that we can cope with how I repeatedly try to motivate students and to somehow also explain to them the importance of diverse language skills and how they can profit from them, what that means for their future.”

In reference to the following sub-chapter on the impact of macro-level discourse, this quote also forebodes how participants have been working in a legitimacy-contesting

setting for a longer while already (“this is always”, “I repeatedly try”). Using the “we” pronoun just like Kristiina, Ronja says about her language-teacher colleagues and their views on macro-level discourse that “we are very, very much of the same opinion, like we feel like we are attacked in a way.” For both of them, this identification has the purpose of feeling supported in the face of an environment somewhat hostile to their work.

It has been established above that contributions in language ideological debates have expanded meaning, implying sociopolitical positions. Based on these quotes that use “language teacher” as a subject position, an argument could be made that the discussion on mandatory Swedish, while here treated as a backdrop for “general and prevalent systems for the formation and articulation of ideas in a particular period of time” (Whittle and Mueller 2010, p. 418) and thus as a case of established discursive patterns, is in itself part of a larger debate on language value which is characterized by less valuing of languages in general. While general Discourses on language instruction in Finland are not at the centre of this paper, they are an under-researched topic and should thus become the topic of future research.

The value in taking a perspective that acknowledges general changes in the valuation of language instruction is lent further credence by how several participants raise general views on languages in instruction as a point of concern even though not explicitly asked about language education in general:

“So I think the situation, when you think all of the languages, I have the feeling that in Finland in the moment the languages are not so, have not so important role than they had before. I think that maths and computer skills and stuff like that are valued more. So of course Swedish is part of this whole situation.” (Sofia)

“Them not having to take their final exam in Swedish didn't help the languages, that they would take the exam in other languages instead. No, on the contrary. It got less. What they take the exam in now: Science subjects. Chemistry, physics, biology, geography, health science. [...] Somehow they don't think anymore that languages are important. Many think like that. Students. And then there is a top group, who does all kinds of things and is interested in everything, the geniuses I would say.” (Kamilla)

There is no room in this thesis to review in how far these assertions are correct, though they are certainly backed up by statistics on e.g. enrolment for the voluntary A2

language (cf. Kykkänen 2015) or participation in the voluntary Swedish exam (see above). However, it shall here suffice to establish that an argument could be made that participants not only feel affected by macro-level discourses in their role as teachers of Swedish, but also in their role as language teachers. In how far the two overlap and resemble each other however goes beyond what can be explored here.

The second central category for self-presentation is, unsurprisingly, being a Swedish teacher. However, some teachers also report that they feel shoehorned into this role, and that dominant discourses ascribe them interests or attitudes based on this professional identity that they do not necessarily have. Livia for instance tells the story of a colleague who asked her after the voting in the parliamentary committee (where mandatory Swedish instruction was backed) if she was “happy now”. Livia wonders at this, saying that

“in my opinion, people inexplicably think these days that Swedish teachers, that it should be, I really like my work, it is very important for me, but they think that it's more than with other teachers and that we have to back it up 150 percent.”

The colleague here attributes her an interest Livia says she does not necessarily have, based on Livia's professional identity. Livia regards this as exemplary of Swedish teachers' placing in general Discourses in the language discussion where it is assumed that she has to agree with all the representations that make Swedish legitimate, and that she has to do so simply on the basis of the fact that she is a Swedish teacher. Mirjami reports such imputed interest on the basis of her identity as a Swedish teacher by students:

“M: I think [my students] uhm, I don't have a clear opinion on [the language discussion], but I think that they think that I have (laughs)
H: Why do you think so?
M: I don't know, I have the feeling that they try to please me and, you know, by not
H: Bringing it up
M: Yeah”

This is very likely due to the nature of the language discussion which, as per Salo (2010b) is characterized by “views tinged in bias”²⁸ or as one participant puts it “black

²⁸ Translation by author. Original reads „Yksipuolisesti värittyne[et] näkemyk[set]

and white” positions. Livia's general environment assumes that Livia supports all the understandings that come with mandatory Swedish simply because she is a Swedish teacher. This is an attribution clearly marked by a Discourse environment characterized by “either-or” which does not allow for midway positions and which aligns a person entirely with their position as an (assumed) supporter of mandatory Swedish which Swedish teachers are usually assumed to be. Macro-level discourse thus ascribes Swedish teachers specific valuations and, by extension, specific policy preferences.

These imputed interests based on the professional role as a Swedish teacher can also result in ideological dilemmas. One finds these in a few of the interviews. Asked about her own view on the citizens' initiative, Mirjami for instance says:

“It's really hard to decide what to think of it. Because professionally, of course it means, I mean, sometimes I feel like I should think that compulsory Swedish must continue, but, it's complicated because, how it would affect our job situation for example, if it didn't continue like this. On the other hand, it might be easier for everyone if only the motivated students would come to the courses. So it's. I don't know.”

Mirjami feels like “professionally” she “should think” a certain way, stressing that this is a professional viewpoint probably because of the discourse on Swedish teachers' views, which she is aware are assumed to be entirely supportive of mandatory status. (The tangible benefit of having secure employment is used as an example probably because Mirjami presumes that it is the most obvious to the outsider, i.e. the researcher). The person who mentions the possible benefits of elective Swedish is a more private version of Mirjami who, as a person without interests imputed by macro-level discourse, has access to different interpretative repertoires (i.e. arguments *against* mandatory Swedish like the more pleasant teaching situation). Mirjami consequently struggles to instantiate both versions of herself at the same time because their interests are not allowed to overlap as per the positions available at macro level, resulting in her abandoning her next to last sentence and correcting it to “I don't know”.

Participants are overwhelmingly more likely to stress romantic value notions for Swedish than is the case in macro-level discourse. This difference appears to be primarily connected to the role understanding of being a language teacher, associated by

most participants with a position that values all languages. Usually strongly identifying with this role, participants tend to evaluate the public discussion on the role of Swedish negatively, feeling that it renders their work more difficult by making it harder for students to see the value in both learning Swedish in particular and in language study in general. To a certain extent, language legitimization then also becomes an issue of personal interest instead of only being the fulfilling of an externally assigned task. Consequently, the current discursive environment puts pressure on teachers and is experienced as stressful as it poses an obstacle to both. Participants have also made the experience that people impute them certain views based on the positions available in macro-level discourse and their identity as Swedish teachers. Findings illustrate that this can have both negative and positive consequences. The following sub-chapter will continue to give a more detailed assessment of the impact of macro-level discourse.

5.3 The Impact of Macro-level Discourses on the Local Level

The most important remark to be made for this research question is that there was some disagreement among participants as to the extent to which the discussion on the citizens' initiative actually constitutes a moment of debate climax. I have established above that both of the characteristics of crisis moments provided in the theoretical framework are found in this case in that there is both questioning of social and of institutional conditions of Swedish instruction. In spite of that, participants usually considered the public discussion on the citizens' initiative simply a continuation of the preceding, long-standing language debate, containing the same arguments voiced by the same parties. For instance, Pauliina first acknowledges the special character of the citizens' initiative as an episode in the language debate when asked on whether she follows the media coverage: "Now I read it because it's on that level, but the, when they write to the papers I usually skip it because it's boring, they bring the arguments so many times it's boring." Later, however, she relegates it to being but one episode in an endless discussion and conducive to exactly the same discursive patterns and by extension the same events as before:

“As I suppose it will be [an endless discussion] today too because they won't vote for it, so it will start again from the beginning, after this whole. So then there's a little time, and then they start the discussion again. Then we have to vote again for, I just always, I think we have to change the legislation not to get that. To be able to skip Swedish in schools.”

She consequently acknowledges the citizens' initiative as a moment of special character, but the pattern with which the language discussion has previously been conducted leads her to believe in established macro-level patterns that it does not diverge from in her view.

Mirjami appears torn on whether the discussion in the context of the citizens' initiative constitutes an exceptional moment in the language debate, repairing her sentence when identifying the voting in the Education and Culture Committee as a decisive moment. She however does not report seeing major changes in the macro-level discourse when asked whether she thinks the current episode of the language discussion affects her classroom:

“And cause it's been an ongoing discussion for years now, so, it hasn't been changing this much. So maybe if it would change dramatically then that might be some. I don't know, last week it kind of changed, cause they voted on this and yeah. But no, I didn't notice anything [changing in my classroom] last week.”

This is an overarching sentiment across participants: The parliamentary voting marks a climax moment in the political reality because it is the first time elective Swedish might actually become a reality. The discussion that accompanies this new political reality however is usually perceived to be marked by the same major discursive structures as the preceding language debate.

The fact that participants, in spite of all of them stating that they were following up on the developments regarding the citizens' initiative at least to a certain extent, usually did not identify this moment as one of heightened contest of dominant value notions speaks of the severity with which the debate has been conducted heretofore. One finds this e.g. in Salo (2010a) when he states that “there is hardly another Finnish (lower secondary) school subject [...] which arouses such fervour in people as does

Swedish”²⁹, characterizing the discussion as “heavy”³⁰ (2010a) and participants voicing their opinion as “vocal”³¹ (2010b). Participants have thus for a longer time already worked in a discursive environment which explicitly questions the value of Swedish and the status quo of compulsory instruction. It is more so that political reality in the form of the parliamentary voting on the status of Swedish has now adjusted to the “sociopolitical ideals” (Blommaert 1999, p. 2) expressed in the language debate rather than it being the other way around, meaning that there has been little perceived discursive change.

The extent to which participants report that this particular instance of the discussion is directly affecting their work is thus limited. The most direct case of incursion is probably reported by Silja, who during her interview told the following story:

S: There were even some groups who came to our school and they had these pencils with (slaps table) 'ei pakkoruotsia', so they were dealing

H: Like with pupils in the school?

S: Yeah, they were a group of Finnish, uh, students, I don't know it was some political party from some, I don't know [if] it was perussuomalaiset [...] they came to our school and I was. God. (sighs) And they were talking about it should be not compulsory and bla bla. We could as well have Russian as compulsory language because we have a history with them too, things like that.”

While Silja appears to feel very personally affected by this instance (“God”, nonverbal utterances), her phrasing “and bla bla” or “things like that” also implies that she sees the student group to only have rehashed generally circulating arguments that she assumes her interlocutor to already know. Beyond these very immediate cases, which appear uncommon, it is more helpful to make more general comments on the extent to which participants believe macro-level discourses to affect discourses at the micro level (i.e. teachers' working environment), since participants view the discussion on the citizens' initiative to fit into generally prevalent patterns.

²⁹ Translation by author. Original reads „Tuskin mikään muu suomalaisen (perus)koulun oppiaine [...] herättää ihmisissä yhtä suuria intohimoja kuin ruotsi.“

³⁰ Translation by author. Original reads „vilkasta keskustelua

³¹ Translation by author. Original reads „[puolustetaan ja vastustetaan julkisessa keskustelussa] äänekkäästi“

Mirjami (a university teacher) believes that students actually make an effort to keep the discussion outside of her classroom:

“M: I haven't really, uhm when I read these questions, it was actually the first time I have thought about it. I haven't really thought about it that way. I have been following the discussion, but I haven't thought about how it affects the atmosphere in the class. Cause the students are smart, they are friendly and nice and well-behaved, so they don't demonstrate in the class. They might discuss it with each other after the class or before but

H: They keep it outside your own classroom, basically.

M: Yeah, yeah.”

This might serve as an additional explanation for why changes in the intensity of the legitimacy contest at macro level do not have an immediate impact on university teachers' work: Ultimately, students mediate this impact, and university students might perceive it as rude to start a discussion in the classroom (unless possibly prompted by the teacher, which explains Mirjami's unwillingness to have explicit discussions about the value of Swedish).

Nevertheless, some of the participants teaching at university level report rare, isolated incidents of outright antagonistic student behaviour that clearly draws on macro-level discourse. For instance, Aino tells the following story of one of her students:

“So in the beginning of that class I did [...] this introductory questionnaire, like what wishes they have and so on. And on that one he had written something like 'Pakkoruotsi pois' or something like that. So something very direct about how it's pointless. [...]. And then I made these feedback forms in my own course where he was, and there I asked what was good, what was bad about this class, and then at the end there was this free space where you could write whatever you want. And he wrote nothing for what was good and what was bad. [...]. And then in the free space he wrote 'stop the inhumane practice of mandatory Swedish’”.

Being a university student, the student in question appears very aware of existing macro-level discourses as he makes two direct discursive references (“Pakkoruotsi pois” is a slogan among opponents of mandatory Swedish, while labelling it “inhumane” or “oppressive” also occurred during the discussion (cf. e.g. Mahlamäki 2014). This awareness of macro-level discourses contrasts somewhat with the situation found at school level (see below). Aino later tells me that the person in question still did their

assigned work and passed the class, and that she therefore did not much care about the negative attitude, believing these discursive references to have been supposed to serve as provocation. University students are thus aware of macro-level discourses but use them strategically, tending to refrain from referencing them for reasons of politeness and usually doing their assigned work.

At school level, there are diverging opinions as to the extent to which students pick up on macro-level discourses on language value, though participants tend to think it is limited. For instance, Ronja says that the macro-level discussion does not really affect her students:

“So this discussion about the obligation to learn Swedish, it's something that, it's not so much taking place in schools, actually. So I think students themselves don't speak so much about being forced to learn Swedish, it's the parents and some politicians. [...] I have to say that this discussion is a bit absurd. Because it happens really in the media, it may happen by their parents, but at least the children, when they're teenagers, they don't care.”

Ronja's assessment was an oft-repeated one in the interviews with school teachers: According to participants, teenagers consider the discussion too abstract and part of the political realm with little relevance for their own lives. This might also serve as an additional explanation for why the discussion on the citizens' initiative as a debate climax point has no clear local repercussions: Participants who work in school tend to assume that their students do not follow up on the discussion in the media and are not aware of political developments. For instance, Pauliina states that even the students in her A-level Swedish class were not aware that Turku was working on abolishing the option for A-level Swedish (which, as raised in 4.1, was also subject to sizeable public discussion).

If explicit questioning takes place at this level, it usually involves questioning the utility of learning Swedish, suggesting once again that notions of utility are the most dominant form of language value in teachers' work environment. They transpire even at school level where students tend not to follow the public discussion and thus prove themselves again to be the main type of value basis in the present-day language discussion. Pauliina (who works at a school with a science focus) reports that she regularly faces students asserting that they personally do not need Swedish:

“[I notice that students are not motivated because] they say I hate this. They can start the lesson or the new course saying I hate Swedish I don't like this. This isn't important for me, I don't understand this. Usually they are very open with that. [That happens] nearly every course which I start, because it's not so popular to study Swedish.”

The same distinction by setting can be applied to parents' discursive influence, who, next to media and peers, are identified by participants as the main actors in students' relevant discursive environment. For instance, Ronja, when asked about parents' attitudes to Swedish, says that “I think as for the parents of my students it hasn't affected a lot. We're a language school so I think they're very motivated.” Pauliina, who has worked in both lower-secondary and upper-secondary school, makes a distinction between the two levels of instruction when it comes to the significance of parents' discourse:

P: I think at this age [A/N: in upper-secondary school], parents are not, they don't have the same influence to our students as they have at the lower level. So I've never heard that someone would have said my parents say or something like that. So it's, no.

H: But at the lower level?

P: Yes (imitates student voice) my mother said that it's not important (end imitating student voice) to learn Swedish and so on. Yeah, there you can hear it. Unfortunately. ”

Here it appears that younger students at times carry parents' discourses into the classroom (in Pauliina's case, students even explicitly quote their parents) more than they would reference media. Challenges for teachers deriving from the discursive backdrop consequently vary depending on place of employment, since parents sending their children to a school with a language focus might stress different notions of language value to begin with. This means that it is only in some settings that teachers have to react to students' replicating parents' discourses.

Another important factor is geographic location: Connecting back to the individual-focused utility notions that characterize local-level language legitimization, it is hardly surprising that geographic location also plays a significant role in the extent to which students regard Swedish as valuable from a utility standpoint and conversely, in the extent to which teachers have to provide value notions by themselves to compete with those advanced in macro-level discourse. For instance, Ronja says

“I think [the extent to which media discussion increases the discussion at school-level] is something that depends on where you live [...] For example I used to teach in Naantali, where they have [Naantali spa] and Moominworld [A/N: An adventure park based on the Moomin characters], and those are places that will need people, summer workers, who [know] Swedish. So teaching Swedish in Naantali was never a problem if they know that they can get a job. So it's also a regional issue.”

In settings where high instrumentalist value, the currently dominant value notion, can be derived from the environment and from structures obvious to students, teachers thus have it a lot easier not to have to provide representations by themselves if they want to present Swedish as a useful, and as per utility Discourse valuable language.

This is also reflected in the experiences of Kristiina, who teaches a lot of students from the more Eastern regions of Finland. She states that at the beginning of a class, about 20 percent of students “have a wrong idea of why Swedish is still spoken in Finland today.” She quotes these students' views on compulsory Swedish as

“it's like this for historical reasons, because they haven't abolished it. But it would be about time to do so because you don't need that. [...] Everyone in Finland speaks Finnish. Or English.”

These local discourses are very reflective of the dominant macro-level discourses that oppose mandatory Swedish: Utility and globalist discourse discard romantic notions of language value (like historical heritage expressed in a language) as irrelevant reasons for language learning. As per utility discourse, only the extent to which a language is actually needed makes it valuable. There is little surprise in the fact then that merely entering a new part of Finland and discovering new linguistic market structures by themselves leads the same students to quickly change their attitudes, realizing the value in Swedish when meeting monolingual Swedish-speakers and thereby experiencing a situation where they truly need Swedish. Kristiina regards these encounters as the central elements in most students' attitude changes.

Due to the the increasing importance of instrumentalist value notions, these experiences with local conditions appear to be the most effective tools in portraying Swedish as a legitimate language, particularly if combined with legitimization practices as per the first sub-chapter. Most participants evaluate the situation in Turku as rather advantageous in that respect, giving them e.g. the option to go to Swedish-language theater or use Swedish-language media. There is, however, still room for improvements

in a few participants' view in the extent to which Swedish appears a valuable language in Turku from a utility standpoint. Kamilla for instance says:

“Somehow Swedish here remains so exotic, it lacks vitality even though there's also Swedish-speakers here in Turku, but yeah. There should be more contact. [...] [Students] are probably afraid of Swedish-speakers, and we, somehow they are, I don't know, these are two, like, separate groups. Entirely. Swedish-speakers and Finnish-speakers. And then even though some of them have Swedish-speaking friends, they speak Finnish with each other. And some students have Swedish-speaking parents, and they still speak Finnish with each other. I think that's a pity.”

This separation is problematic insofar as it changes students' perception of the world around them, making it a world in which Swedish is not present and thus not valuable from a utility standpoint. Kamilla contrasts this with English which her students usually regard as the most useful language because of how it is present in the world around them. Other participants in addition use language rights Discourse to argue for why Swedish-speakers should be more insistent on actually using Swedish.

My own findings are also in line with those of Sajavaara (2006): The impact of state language requirements on perceived instrumentalist value (and by extension on perceived value of Swedish in general) is a lot more significant in higher education and at upper-secondary level where students already have clear future goals and can derive utility from the language's position in their mapped-out career path. For instance, Mirjami contrasts her experiences working in school with her experiences working in university in the following way:

“I think it's easier here, because people, students, they know, they often know what they need to do, and they're quite motivated in their studies and in their own field, and they know how to behave, so it's not really an issue.”

School teachers have to find a way to work around this, often by stressing utility in relation to students' present situation:

“I try to explain with practical examples. Cause if you tell a 14-year-old that he or she will have a brilliant career and much easier in working life and much better salary if you know Swedish, they won't listen to you and they won't, you know, they do not believe you. So I usually just take, you know, very practical examples and well, you learn some basic Swedish then you can, you have the possibility to apply for a summer job in Norway and you get loads of money and you can buy a moped.” (Ronja)

Both approaches are, however, characterized by an emphasis on utility as a factor in language valuation. Ronja also actively takes into account students' priorities, making it appear as common sense that students create their own value notions and that if she wants to have an impact on the latter, she has to find a way to work with and around students' preferences and goals, reflecting the present-day emphasis on learners' own goals.

As expected, students' background might also have an impact on their notions of language value. It is particularly relevant for how utility can be derived from conscious career planning and awareness of the language requirements that make Swedish valuable. Though this distinction is less apparent at the university level (where a certain selection by background has already occurred), several of the participants who teach at school state that there clearly are student groups that have realized the importance of Swedish for their future, and that these are the students who tend to perform better. For instance, Kamilla says:

“The better students, those who already know what they, what they want to become, of course they are motivated, because they understand that they need Swedish. For their studies after high school. If you don't have a goal you don't know what this and that is for.”

This reflects one of the most central criticisms of marketisation in education, namely that a neoliberal market conception where all actors act in line with rational choice theory “totally neglects the social determination of educational choice” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 94), meaning that abolition of corrective measures by the state will exacerbate educational inequalities. The interviews give some insight into how individualization of practices might be contributive to unequal performance. For instance, some participants say that they like to give good and interested students extra work. Additionally, this might also have implications in the context of the lower valuation of language education as a whole (see previous research question) where only those who know how to “play the school game” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 85) still see a value in learning languages and can increasingly turn their investment into positive distinction because language studies, like other elements of education, are less and less compulsory and thus increasingly offer opportunity for positive distinction.

Because of the vast differences in setting, it is difficult to find a generalizable pattern to how macro- and micro-level discourses interact. This is exacerbated by how the discussion on the citizens' initiative, in spite of being associated with a changed political reality, is not regarded as being associated with significant changes in macro-level discourse. Generally speaking, geographical differences play a role in the extent to which macro-level discourses affect micro-level discourses, since in areas where Swedish has more visible instrumentalist value, legitimacy is not so easily contested. The state-created and institutionalized notions of legitimacy, which as per the theoretical framework are the central structures creating legitimacy, have more relevance at university level where students are aware of language policies. Additionally, the impact of individual discursive actors differs by setting: Older students are more aware of political discourses, while younger students are more likely to be influenced by their parents. At the same time, most university students due to their awareness of language requirements have realized at least the instrumentalist value of Swedish for themselves, the impact of political discourses at this level is thus limited. At school level, discussions on language utility dominate, though students' limited awareness of current events means that change in macro-level discourses have limited repercussions at this level of instruction as well.

6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this final part of my paper, I shall answer the research questions and discuss my findings before pointing out possible directions for future research.

To what extent do Swedish language teachers regard language legitimization as their task?

The empirical data reveals that language legitimization is considered a task by participants, albeit to differing extents. Legitimization as a task to an extent derives from teachers' job description (cf 4.3). However, value transmission also appears to be perceived as a task due to teachers' personal beliefs: Participants tend to see knowledge of any language as valuable, have made experiences to that effect and therefore tend to see it as a desirable outcome that students value Swedish at least to a certain extent (see also my discussion of the second research question). Many participants therefore evaluated their tasks from a personal standpoint rather than merely one of assigned duty.

The main deviation from the theoretical framework lies in the limited role that teachers ascribe themselves in shaping students' views, and by extension their language values: Participants accord significant influence to other discursive actors (mainly parents, media and peers) and tend to put themselves at the same, or even at a lower, level of influence. Teachers do attempt to contribute to students' value notions, but they acknowledge that the latter are beyond their control to a significant extent. The implications of this view are discussed further below.

Legitimization in practice is found to mainly draw on utility notions, reflecting the shift towards instrumentalist value that has taken place in the language discussion as a whole. It is also found to be limited for practical reasons: Teachers may want to avoid arguments or repetitive discussions and thus may prefer to avoid any discussion of the value of Swedish. Most importantly, they may also find they simply do not have the

time to go over anything but the grammar and vocabulary foreseen by the curriculum which participants tend to describe as (overly) extensive. Very high demands have previously been found to have negative implications for students' motivation (cf. Kajander 2010). In addition to alleviating this damper on students' motivation, lowering the requirements would also enable teachers to focus more on elements that students perceive as useful or interesting. This change in focus would cater to individual utility, the current “main currency” of language value.

How do language values expressed by Swedish teachers relate to language values expressed at macro level?

The thesis serves to confirm the difference found by Salo (2010a and 2010b) between teachers' personal belief in romantic values and the instrumentalist values primarily used in legitimization practices. Participants personally value Swedish and tend to support mandatory instruction. This serves to explain why language legitimization is also regarded as a task from a personal standpoint. While “Swedish teacher” serves as an identity category, the one most commonly used by participants to explain their own views and attitudes is “language teacher”, used to denote a person who values all languages and uses different interpretative repertoires to talk about language instruction than those that dominate the public discussion. Indeed, previous research has shown that language teachers value culture as an aspect of language education (cf. Yang 2000), have intrinsic motivation (cf. Kreishan & Al-Dhaimat 2015), feel drawn to their subject of instruction and accord language teaching a political dimension (cf. Borg 2006).

The thesis also reveals an impact of the polarized debate structure (cf. Salo 2010b) on how participants are perceived in their role as teachers of Swedish: Some participants report others' assumption that they fully back mandatory instruction and all the notions that it represents. While most participants in fact do support Swedish as a compulsory subject, this is not always the case, and regardless of their views participants also acknowledge problems with the current system of Swedish instruction. They thus have more of a distance to the question of language acquisition policy than macro-level discourse would presume. Both this polarization and the difference in type

of value serve to explain why participants tend to experience the language discussion as negative.

How do experiences with the task of language legitimization change during moments of heightened contest of legitimacy as seen by Swedish teachers?

Finding a clear answer to this research question is rendered more difficult by how participants tended not to regard the episode surrounding the citizens' initiative as an instance of particularity, neither regarding the macro-level discussion nor regarding developments in the local context. However, this discovery is revealing as to the severity with which the language discussion has previously been conducted: Swedish teachers have long been working against a discursive backdrop of intense legitimacy contest to which political reality had adjusted for the period of time in question. And while participants report that they like and enjoy their work, this contest is still experienced negatively.

Findings nevertheless provide insight into the consequences of public (language) value contest at the micro level: Geographic location, level of instruction and type of institution affect the extent to which macro-level discussions matter at the local level and impact teachers' work. Students' background also makes a difference: The thesis thus echoes a common concern with neoliberal conceptions of education (cf. Simola, Rinne and Kivirauma 2001) that was clearly voiced in the discussion on the citizens' initiative (cf. FNB-SPT 2014, Liiten 2014b): The concern that elective status could lead to greater inequality across students due to differences in their family background, with some families less likely to be able to pass on the value of Swedish. With practical obstacles in the way of language legitimization by teachers, schooling will make less of a contribution to alleviating this gap.

There is a certain danger in teachers' belief that their influence on students is limited by the influence of other discursive actors and that students' views are, to a significant extent, beyond their control: A sense of lack of control and inability to influence one's environment is indicative of low self-efficacy (cf. Bandura 1995), which Bandura defines as "individuals' beliefs about their capabilities to successfully

accomplish a particular course of action” (qtd. in OECD 2014, p. 184). Self-efficacy is a central concept for teachers' professional role and practices and has been associated with improved student performance as well as teachers' job satisfaction, enthusiasm and commitment (cf. OECD 2014, pp. 181). Byram (2002, p. 17) predicts that with increasing interest in the political dimension of language instruction, “language teachers may react by trying to distance themselves from political issues and take refuge in the belief that language learning involves nothing more than skills and 'competence'”. This thesis shows that this does not apply in the case at hand, as participants overwhelmingly acknowledge that their task goes beyond mere improving of skills. Coupled with constrained implementation, however, this awareness results in a sensation of limited control. Participants attribute this sensation both to the increasing individualization of instruction as well as to the existence of influential, standardized macro-level discourses that call into question the value of Swedish.

When it comes to potential for further research, it might be useful to study the experiences of older participants, i.e. of those who have taught Swedish in the 1980s and earlier already, and to contrast their views on language legitimization with those of present-day Swedish teachers. The 1980s mark a turning point in the discourses on language education as a whole (cf. Sajavaara 2006, p. 3) and on Swedish instruction in particular (cf. Bruun 2015). Such an approach could thus reveal the impact of a more distinct change in macro-level discourse than is the case in my empirical backdrop.

Finally, the thesis indicates that it might be worthwhile to extend an analysis of macro- vs. micro-level discourse to language instruction in Finland in general. While the number of students taking the voluntary Swedish exam may have declined significantly (see 4.1), the same is true for B2-languages as a whole (cf. Niemeläinen 2014). Naturally, it has to be admitted that Swedish as a national language takes on a special position among languages in Finland. Previous analyses of discourses on the subject have reflected this special character (cf. e.g. Salo 2012, Hult & Pietikäinen 2014, Bruun 2015). At the same time, it has also been found that Swedish is

increasingly represented as “a language among others”³² (qtd. in Green-Vänttinen, Korkman & Lehti-Eklund 2010, p. 10). This development should lead one to wonder in how far the discussion on mandatory Swedish merely draws on and follows a larger value shift in the context of language instruction, the parallels to which might have been clouded by the emphasis on the interdiscursive links particular to the case of Swedish. There is a noticeable lack of studies on discourses on language education in general. Since this thesis has showcased that discourses affect teachers' work, I believe that there is value in such an approach. Additionally, research needs to further clarify the conditions for, and processes of, legitimization of study content against the backdrop of increasing freedom of choice in education, so that not only those who know how to “play the school game” (Simola, Rinne & Kivirauma 2001, p. 85) walk away with advantageous capital in Bourdieu's sense.

³² Translation by author. Original reads „språk bland andra“

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M & Kärreman, D 2000, 'Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis'. *Human Relations*, Vol. 53, Nr. 9, pp. 1125 – 1149.
- Anonymous 2014. 'All six citizen's initiatives have failed – activists accuse Parliament of intentionally slowing the process', *YLE*, [online] 13 October, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://yle.fi/uutiset/all_six_citizens_initiatives_have_failed_activists_accuse_parliament_of_intentionally_slowing_the_process/7525779>.
- Bandura, A (ed.) 1995, *Self-efficacy in changing societies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Blommaert, J 1999, *Language ideological debates*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Blommaert, J 2005, *Discourse*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Borg, S 2006, 'The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers', *Language Teaching Research* Vol. 10, Nr. 1, pp. 3 – 31.
- Bourdieu, P 1977, *Reproduction in education, society and culture*, Sage, London.
- Bourdieu, P 1991, *Language & symbolic power*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Bruun, S. 2015. 'Forskare: Putin kan rädda skolsvenskan' [Researcher: Putin can save school Swedish], *Hufvudstadsbladet*, [online] 24 February, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://hbl.fi/nyheter/2015-02-24/725496/forskare-putin-kan-radda-skolsvenskan>>.
- Byram, M 2002, 'Politics and policies in assessing intercultural competence in language teaching', in V Kohonen & P Kaikkonen (eds.), pp. 17 – 32.
- Constitution of Finland [unofficial translation by Ministry of Justice of Finland], [pdf] 11 June 1999, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.finlex.fi/sv/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf>>.
- Council of Europe 2010, 'Application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority

- Languages in Finland', [pdf] Council of Europe, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/Report/EvaluationReports/Finland_ECRML4_en.pdf>
- Daiute, C & and Lightfoot, C (eds.) 2004, *Narrative analysis – studying the development of individuals in society*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Fairclough, N 1992, *Discourse and social change*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fairclough, N 2003, *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*, Routledge, London.
- Fairclough, N 2010, *Critical discourse analysis – the critical study of language* (2nd edition), Pearson Education, Harlow.
- Finnäs, F 2013, *Finlandssvenskarna 2012 – en statistik rapport* [Finland-Swedes 2012 – a statistical report], Folktinget, Helsinki.
- Finnish National Board of Education 2003, 'National core curriculum for upper secondary schools 2003', [pdf] Finnish National Board of Education, viewed 13 May 2015, <http://www.oph.fi/download/47678_core_curricula_upper_secondary_education.pdf>
- Finnish National Board of Education 2004, 'Valtionhallinnon kielitutkintojen perusteet' [Principles of language exams for national administration], Finnish National Board of Education, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://oph.fi/download/115055_VALTIONHALLINNON_KIELITUTKINTOJEN_PERUSTEET_15.8.doc>.
- Finnish National Board of Education 2011, 'Koulutuksen tilastollinen vuosikirja', [Statistical yearbook on education], [pdf] Finnish National Board of Education, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://www.oph.fi/download/141011_Koulutuksen_tilastollinen_vuosikirja_2011.pdf>.
- FNB-SPT 2014, 'Skolsvenskan blev en jämlikhetsfråga' [School Swedish has become a question of social equality], *Hufvudstadsbladet*, [online] 11 November, viewed 21 April 2015, <hbl.fi/nyheter/2014-11-11/680976/skolsvenskan-blev-en-jamlikhetsfraga>.
- Green-Vänttinen, M, Korkman, C & Lehti-Eklund, H 2010, 'Svenska I finska

- gynmanisier' [Swedish in Finnish upper-secondary schools], [pdf] Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki, viewed 21 April 2015, <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/30083/Nordica_Helsingiensia_22.pdf?sequence=2>.
- Helling, B 2014, 'Befria oss från språkslaveriet' [Free us from language slavery], *Hufvudstadsbladet*, [online] 23 November, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://hbl.fi/nyheter/2014-11-23/686026/befria-oss-fran-sprakslaveriet>>.
- Hult, FM & Pietikäinen, S 2014, 'Shaping discourses of multilingualism through a language ideological debate – The case of Swedish in Finland', *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol. 13, Nr. 1, pp 1-20.
- Kajander, K 2010, 'Kielisalkku ruotsin kielen opetuksessa' [Language portfolio in Swedish instruction], *Kieli, Koulutus ja Yhteiskunta*, [online] November, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/kielisalkku-ruotsin-kielen-opetuksessa/>>.
- Kohler Riessman, C 1993, *Narrative analysis*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Kohonen, V and Kaikkonen, P (eds) 2002, *Quo vadis foreign language education*, Reports from the Department of Teacher Education in Tampere University A 27, University of Tampere, Tampere.
- Kreishan, L & Al-Dhaimat, Y 2015, 'Motivation and job satisfaction among Jordanian teachers of English', *International Journal of Academic Research* Vol. 7, Nr. 1, pp. 236 – 246.
- Kykkänen, V 2015, 'Kieltenopettaja: Vapaaehtoisia kielivalintoja tehdään jatkossa entistä vähemmän' [Language teacher: Elective languages will be chosen less than ever before], *YLE Online*, [online] 5 March, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://yle.fi/uutiset/kieltenopettaja_vapaaehtoisia_kielivalintoja_tehdaan_jatkossa_entista_vahemman/7844801>.
- Landor, P 2015, 'Beslut och sätt punkt' [Decide and end it], *Åbo Underrättelser*, [online] 27 February, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.abounderrattelser.fi/news/2015/02/beslut-och-satt-punkt.html>>.
- Language Choice Society c. 2013, 'Usein esitettyjä väitteitä' [Frequently advanced arguments], [online], viewed 21 April 2015,

<http://ruotsivapaaehtoiseksi.fi/ukk.php#väitteet>>.

- Lester, J N 2014, 'Discursive psychology: methodology and applications', *Qualitative Psychology*, Vol.1, Nr. 2, pp. 141-143.
- Liiten M 2014a, 'Pakollista ruotsin opiskelua puidaan eduskunnassa' [Parliament discusses mandatory Swedish instruction], *Helsingin Sanomat*, [online] 11 November, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.hs.fi/politiikka/a1415672545551>>
- Liiten, M 2014b, 'Pakkoruotsia verrattiin sivistysvaliokunnan kuulemisessa homovastaisuuteen ja orjuuteen' [At the hearing in the Education and Culture Committee, mandatory Swedish was compared to homophobia and slavery], *Helsingin Sanomat*, [online] 11 November, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/a1415679293663>>
- Lindblad, S & Popkewitz, T S (eds) 2001, *Education governance and social integration and exclusion: studies in the powers of reason and the reasons of power. A report from the EGSIE Project*, Department of Education Uppsala University, Uppsala.
- Lojander-Visapää, C 2008, 'New Bilingualism in the Bilingual Finnish Context', *Europäisches Journal für Minderheitenfragen*, Nr. 2, pp. 109-118.
- Mahlamäki, H 2014, 'Perussuomalaisten pamfletti: Näin pakkoruotsi sortaa valtaväestöä' [Pamphlet by 'True Finns' Party: This is how mandatory Swedish oppresses the country's population], *Helsingin Sanomat*, [online] 24 April, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.hs.fi/politiikka/a1398303541972>>.
- Malinen, OP, Väisänen, P & Savolainen, H 2012, 'Teacher education in Finland: a review of a national effort for preparing teachers for the future', *The Curriculum Journal*, Vol. 23, Nr. 4, pp. 567 - 584.
- Matriculation Examination Board 2010, 'Ylioppilastutkinto 2010 – Tilastoja Ylioppilastutkinnosta' [Matriculation exam 2010 – Statistics on the matriculation exam], [pdf] Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, viewed 21 April 2015, <https://www.ylioppilastutkinto.fi/images/sivuston_tiedostot/stat/Ylioppilastutkinto_2010.pdf>
- McLean, N 2012, 'Researching academic identity: using discursive psychology as an approach', *International Journal for Academic Development*, Vol. 17, Nr. 2, pp. 97 – 108.

- McRae, K D, Helander, M & Luoma, S 1999, *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingual Societies – Vol. 3: Finland*, Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, Helsinki.
- Moring, T, Husband, C, Lojander-Visapää C, Vincze, L, Fomina J & Nieminen-Mänty, N 2011, 'Media Use and Ethnolinguistic Vitality in Bilingual Communities', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 32, Nr. 2, pp. 169-186.
- Niemeläinen, J 2014, 'Koululaisten kielitaito yksipuolistuu – saksan mahtiasema on romahtanut' [Students' language skills are becoming less diverse – dominant position of German has crumbled], *Helsingin Sanomat*, [online] 7 October, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/a1412569111017>>.
- Nikula, T, Pöyhönen, S, Huhta, A & Hildén, R 2010, 'When MT+2 is not enough – Tensions within foreign language education in Finland' *Sociolinguistica*, Vol. 24, pp. 25-42.
- OECD 2013, 'Official language', [online] *OECD Statistics Portal*, viewed 21 April 2015, <stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=5590>.
- OECD 2014, *TALIS 2013 results: an international perspective on teaching and learning*, [online] OECD Publishing, viewed 13 May 2015 <http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/education/talis-2013-results_9789264196261-en#page1>
- Parliament of Finland 2015, 'Eduskunnan kirjelmä 54/2014 vp' [Parliamentary writ 54/2014 vp], 6 March, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://www.eduskunta.fi/faktatmp/utatmp/akxtmp/ek_54_2014_p.shtml>.
- Pöyhönen, S & Luukka MR 2007, 'Kohti tulevaisuuden kielikoulutusta – kielikoulutuspoliittisen projektin loppuraportti' [Towards the language education of the future – final report on the language acquisition policy project], [pdf] Jyväskylä University, Jyväskylä, viewed 21 April 2015, <https://www.jyu.fi/hum/laitokset/solki/tutkimus/projektit/kielo/projektin_loppuraportti/KIEPOn_loppuraportti.pdf>
- Provenzo Jr., EF & Baker Provenzo, A 2009, *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education*, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles.
- Rostila, I 2014, 'Vapaaehtoinen ruotsi on hyvinvointietu' [Elective Swedish is a Welfare Benefit], Suomen Perusta, Helsinki.

- 'Ruotsin kieli valinnaiseksi oppiaineeksi kaikilla kouluasteilla' 2013 [Making Swedish an elective subject at all levels of instruction], [online] *Kansalaisaloite* 14 March, viewed 21 April 2015, <<https://www.kansalaisaloite.fi/fi/aloite/131>>.
- Sahlberg, P 2011, *Finnish lessons – What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?*, Teachers College Press, New York.
- Sajavaara, K 2006, 'Kielivalinnat ja kielten opiskelu' [Language Choices and Language Study], in R Alanen, H Dufva & K Mäntylä (eds), *Kielen päällä - näkökulmia kieleen ja kielenkäyttöön*. Jyväskylän Yliopiston Soveltavan Kielentutkimuksen Keskus, Jyväskylä.
- Salo, OP 2010a, 'Ruotsin opettamisen ihanuus ja kurjuus – ruotsinopettajien ajatuksia oppiaineestaan' [The sweetness and sadness of teaching Swedish – Swedish teachers' thoughts on their subject], in E Ropo, H Silfverberg & T Soini(eds), *Toisensa kohtaavat ainedidaktikat Tampere: Tampereen yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitoksen julkaisusarja*, University of Tampere, Tampere, pp. 355–368.
- Salo, OP 2010b, 'Ruotsin opettaminen tänään ja huomenna – mitä ruotsinopettajat ajattelevat?' [Teaching Swedish today and tomorrow – what do Swedish teachers think?] *Kielikoulutuspolitiikan verkoston verkkolehti*, [online] May, viewed 21 April 2015, <www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/ruotsin-opettaminen-tanaan-ja-huomenna-mita-ruotsinopettajat-ajattelevat/>.
- Salo, OP 2011, 'Kultturi perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteissa – Kenen kulttuuria on tarkoitus opiskella?' [Culture in the principles of the core curriculum for lower-secondary school – Whose culture is to be studied?], in R Hildén and OP Salo (eds), *Kielikasvatus Tänään ja Huomenna*, WSOYpro Oy, Helsinki, pp. 41 - 64.
- Salo, OP 2012, 'Finland's Official Bilingualism – a Bed of Roses or of Procrustes?', in J Blommaert, S Leppänen, P Pahta & T Räisänen (eds), *Dangerous multilingualism – northern perspectives on order, purity and normality*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 25-40.
- Selovuori, J 1999, *Power and Bureaucracy in Finland 1809-1998*, Edita, Helsinki.
- Simola, H, Rinne, R & Kivirauma J 2001, 'Shifting responsibilities, insolvent clients and double-bound teachers – the appearance of a new system of reason in constructing educational governance and social exclusion/inclusion in Finland?', in S Lindblad &

- TS Popkewitz (eds), pp. 59 – 104.
- Stanley, S & Billig, M 2004, 'Dilemmas of storytelling and identity', in C Daiute and C Lightfoot (eds), pp. 159 – 176.
- Statistics Finland 2014, 'Väestö kielen mukaan 1980 – 2013' [Population by language 1980 – 2013], [online] 21 March, viewed 21 April 2015 <http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2013/vaerak_2013_2014-03-21_tau_001.fi.html>.
- Swedish People's Party 2002, 'Svenska folkpartiets språkmanifest: En unik nationell skatt' [Swedish People's Party's language manifesto: A unique national treasure], viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.fsd.uta.fi/pohtiva/ohjelma?tunniste=sfpsprak2002>>.
- Swedish People's Party 2006, 'Sfp:s program för de tvåspråkiga i Finland' [Swedish People's Party's program for the bilinguals in Finland], [pdf] Swedish People's Party, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://www.sfp.fi/sites/default/files/2_Tvasprakiga%20i%20Finland%202006.pdf>.
- Tapiola, P 2014, 'Jos ruotsi olisi valinnainen, mitä sitten opiskeltaisiin? 'Pelkkää englantia' [If Swedish were elective, what would be studied then? 'Only English'] YLE, [online] 9 January, viewed 21 April 2015, <http://yle.fi/uutiset/jos_ruotsi_olisi_valinnainen_mita_sitten_opiskeltaisiin_pelkkaa_englantia/6960388>.
- Turun Kaupunki 2014, 'Lukioiden opiskelijamäärät' [Student numbers in upper secondary general education schools], [online] 20 September, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.turku.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=201968&GUID={458DD523-2A15-4515-A083-2BF4B84C31B3}>>.
- Turun Kaupunki 2015, 'Tilastotietoja Turusta' [Statistical information about Turku], [online] March 27, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.turku.fi/Public/default.aspx?contentid=491783>>.
- Turun Yliopiston Kielikeskus n.d., 'Ruotsin Kielen Opintopolku' [Study Path for Swedish], [online], viewed 21 April 2015, <<https://nettiopsu.utu.fi/opas/oppiaine.htm?opsId=214&uiLang=fi&lang=fi&lvv=2014&aine=KIRU>>.
- Unger, J 1986, 'Language conflict, nationalism and ethnic separatism in Finland',

- Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, Vol. 2, Nr. 2, pp. 73-101.
- Uusikylä, K & Atjonen, P 2007, *Didaktiikan Perusteet* [The Principles of Didactics], Sanoma Pro, Helsinki.
- Väyrynen, P (ed.) 2011, *TOKI ammatillisessa koulutuksessa* [TOKI in vocational education], Finnish National Board of Education, viewed 21 April 2015, <<http://www.oph.fi/hankkeet/toki>>
- Whittle, A & Mueller F 2010, 'The language of interests: The contribution of discursive psychology', *Human Relations*, Vol. 64, Nr. 3, pp. 415 – 435.
- Yang, ND 2000, ' Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A cross-cultural comparison', *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, Vol. 5, Nr. 1, pp. 39 – 52.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

List of participants (all names used herein are pseudonyms)

Name	Employment
Kamilla	School
Silja	School
Mirjami	University
Aino	University
Sofia	School
Livia	University
Paulina	School
Ronja	School
Kristiina	University

Appendix 2

Interview questionnaire – School teachers

I. Introduction

II.

A. Age

B. Hometown

C. Mother tongue(s)

D. Years of experience teaching Swedish overall

E. Years of experience at current position

III.

- A. Why did you decide to become a teacher for Swedish and how did this happen?
 - i. When did you make this decision
 - ii. Which factors helped you making this decision?
- B. Can you tell me in your own words why you think it's important that your students know Swedish?
- C. Do you enjoy your work? Why/why not?
 - i. Is your work like you expected it to be? Why/why not?

IV.

- A. Can you describe for me the role you have as a Swedish teacher?
 - i. What tasks do you have on a normal day, and which ones only occasionally?
 - ii. How do you measure success or professional achievement for yourself?
 - iii. How much impact do you think you have on students as a teacher? In what ways?
 - iv. What are the most important outcomes of your work? What do you hope to achieve with students?
 - v. Would you say that the following are things you feel you need to achieve/are things that fall within your responsibility:
 - a) Improving language skills
 - b) Students developing an interest in Swedish-language culture
 - c) Improving students' readiness to use Swedish in their everyday life
 - d) Improving students' attitudes towards Swedish
 - e) Making students understand the reasons for Finland's bilingualism
 - f) Making students understand why they need to know Swedish
- B. How much liberty do you have in defining your tasks/your methods of instruction/the contents of your instruction/learning outcomes? (Referring only to the subject of Swedish)
 - i. Are the core curriculum guidelines helpful/too constraining/too vague?
 - a) Do you feel like the curriculum requirements accurately reflect what students need to know in later life? Why/why not?
 - b) Can you tell me about a situation in which the guidelines conflicted with students' needs or wishes? How could this be alleviated?
 - c) Does learning Swedish help students in other subjects?
 - d) Is there anything about the core curriculum requirements you think should be changed? Included? Deleted?

V.

- A. Are you following up on the discussion on the status of Swedish as a subject?
 - i. How does it make you feel?
 - ii. Do you discuss what is happening with your colleagues? Your superiors? If yes, do you perceive these discussions as helpful, or as hindering? What aspects do you talk about? Do your colleagues or superiors have

- very similar opinions, or different ones?
- B. Do you feel like the prospect of elective Swedish affects your classroom?
 - i. When the meaningfulness of/sense in learning Swedish gets discussed in public more, do you feel like that has a negative impact on students' motivation? How do you notice this?
 - ii. Or would you say it has a negative impact on other people's attitudes, like parents or some of your colleagues?
 - iii. Is this something you bring up in your classroom? Why/why not? Under what circumstances would you? How do students react to this?
 - a) What arguments would you/do you use to encourage students to learn Swedish?
 - b) Do you adjust your teaching practices depending on how Swedish is discussed in public? In what way? How did your students react to this?
 - c) Or was there a situation where students/parents/superiors brought it up? How did you react? How would you react if they did?
 - C. What are your personal views on the status of Swedish as a subject?
 - i. Would you rather see Swedish being an elective subject? Why/why not?
 - D. Do you feel sufficiently supported by educational authorities (e.g. ministry of education, OPH, municipal authorities) in your work?
 - i. If not, what could educational authorities do better to support you in your work?
 - E. In your own view, what languages are important for students to know? Why?
- VI. (In case you also teach a subject other than Swedish:)
- A. How do your experiences teaching Swedish compare with your experiences teaching English/German/other subject?
 - i. Why do you think that is? Do you approach your work differently? Do students see you differently?
 - ii. (In case you also teach another language): I already asked you earlier to define your tasks as a Swedish teacher. Would you define your tasks teaching English/German/French.... differently? If yes, in what way?
 - B. (only applicable if you teach/have taught classes both for students who started Swedish in grade 3 or 5, and for those who started in grade 7 (A- vs. B-classes): How do classes where students started learning Swedish early differ from those where they started learning it only later?
 - i. Do you approach them differently?
 - ii. Are students' motivations different?
- VII. Is there anything else you would like to talk about?

Interview questionnaire – University teachers

I. Introduction

II.

- A. Age
- B. Hometown
- C. Mother tongue(s)
- D. Years of experience teaching Swedish overall
- E. Years of experience at current position

III.

- A. Why did you decide to become a teacher in Swedish and how did this happen?
 - i. When did you make this decision?
 - ii. Which factors helped you making this decision?
- B. Can you tell me in your own words why you think it's important that your students know Swedish?
- C. Do you enjoy your work? Why/why not?
 - i. Is your work like you expected it to be? Why/why not?

IV.

- A. Can you describe for me the role you have as a Swedish teacher?
 - i. What tasks do you have on a normal day, and which ones only occasionally?
 - ii. How do you measure success or professional achievement for yourself?
 - iii. How much impact do you think you have on students as a teacher? In what ways?
 - iv. What are the most important outcomes of your work? What do you hope to achieve with students?
 - v. Would you say that the following are things you feel you need to achieve/are things that fall within your responsibility:
 - a) Improving language skills
 - b) Students developing an interest in Swedish-language culture
 - c) Improving students' readiness to use Swedish in their everyday life
 - d) Improving students' attitudes towards Swedish
 - e) Making students understand the reasons for Finland's bilingualism
 - f) Making students understand why they need to know Swedish
- B. How much liberty do you have in defining your tasks/your methods of instruction/the contents of your instruction/learning outcomes?
 - i. Are the guidelines you receive helpful/too constraining/too vague?
 - ii. Do you feel like they accurately reflect what students need to know in later life? Why/why not?
 - iii. Can you tell me about a situation in which the guidelines conflicted with students' needs or wishes? How could this be alleviated?
 - iv. Does learning Swedish help students in other subjects?

V.

- A. Are you following up on the discussion on the status of Swedish as a subject?
 - i. How does it make you feel?
 - ii. Do you discuss what is happening with your colleagues? Your superiors? If yes, do you perceive these discussions as helpful, or as hindering? What aspects do you talk about? Do your colleagues or superiors have very similar opinions, or different ones?
- B. Do you feel like the prospect of elective Swedish affects your classroom?
 - i. When the meaningfulness of/sense in learning Swedish gets discussed in public more, do you feel like that has a negative impact on students' motivation? How do you notice this?
 - ii. Or would you say it has a negative impact on other people's attitudes you interact with at work?
 - iii. Is this something you bring up in your classroom? Why/why not? Under what circumstances would you? How do students react to this?
 - a) What arguments would you/do you use to encourage students to learn Swedish?
 - b) Do you adjust your teaching practices depending on how Swedish is discussed in public? In what way? How did your students react to this?
 - c) Or was there a situation where students/superiors brought it up? How did you react? How would you react if they did?
- C. What are your personal views on the language requirements connected to university degrees?
 - i. Would you rather see the requirements in Swedish be abolished or kept in place? Why/why not?
- D. In your own view, what languages are important for students to know? Why?

VI. (In case you also teach a subject other than Swedish):

- A. How do your experiences teaching Swedish compare with your experiences teaching English/German/other subject?
 - i. Why do you think that is? Do you approach your work differently? Do students see you differently?
 - ii. (In case you also teach another language): I already asked you earlier to define your tasks as a Swedish teacher. Would you define your tasks teaching English/German/French.... differently? If yes, in what way?
- B. (only applicable if you also teach voluntary classes, i.e. classes that do not immediately connect to the aim of students demonstrating that they meet the language requirements for their university degree): How do these classes differ from the "compulsory" classes?
 - i. Do you approach them differently?
 - ii. Are students' motivations different?

VII. Is there anything else you would like to talk about?

Appendix 3

Consent form

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Research aim: The aim of my research project is to study how language teachers are influenced in their work by the changing meaning and value of the target language (language they teach) in the society. The citizens' initiative for elective Swedish indicates the changes in the meaning and position of the Swedish language in Finland. The aim of the research is to study the impact of this change on teachers' professional practices. Primary focus is on the mediation of notions of the importance of Swedish in the Finnish context.

Data collection method: Oral interview, conversation based on researcher questions

Analysis method: Interview will be recorded by researcher and transcribed for research purposes.

Further usage of data: The primary usage of the interview data is for a Master's thesis in the program "Baltic Sea Region Studies" at the University of Tartu. Master's theses in the program are automatically published on the website of the degree program. The researcher may also use the data for further publications on the research topic, e.g. articles in scientific journals, or a PhD thesis. In all cases of publication, anonymity will be maintained and data will be provided in written form only. The interviewer will be the only person working first-hand with data obtained. A copy of the paper in its then-current form will be provided to the respondents upon request.

Anonymity: All data will be anonymized and respondents will be referred to by pseudonyms. Respondents can at any point refuse to provide information requested by

the researcher. They can also at any time after the interview contact the researcher if they wish to withdraw their information or alter a statement. Researcher may contact participant by e-mail after interview in the case of follow-up questions.

My participation in this study is completely voluntary. I am aware that I can decide to stop my participation in any phase or stage of the study. I am aware that even if I decide to stop my participation, data that has been collected can be used as part of the research unless I withdraw consent.

I hereby declare that interviewer has made me aware of the above conditions and confirm by my signature that I agree to them.

Date, place

Participant's signature